This is a digital copy of a book that was preserved for generations on library shelves before it was carefully scanned by Google as part of a project to make the world's books discoverable online.

It has survived long enough for the copyright to expire and the book to enter the public domain. A public domain book is one that was never subject to copyright or whose legal copyright term has expired. Whether a book is in the public domain may vary country to country. Public domain books are our gateways to the past, representing a wealth of history, culture and knowledge that's often difficult to discover.

Marks, notations and other marginalia present in the original volume will appear in this file - a reminder of this book's long journey from the publisher to a library and finally to you.

Usage guidelines

Google is proud to partner with libraries to digitize public domain materials and make them widely accessible. Public domain books belong to the public and we are merely their custodians. Nevertheless, this work is expensive, so in order to keep providing this resource, we have taken steps to prevent abuse by commercial parties, including placing technical restrictions on automated querying.

We also ask that you:

+ *Make non-commercial use of the files* We designed Google Book Search for use by individuals, and we request that you use these files for personal, non-commercial purposes.
+ *Refrain from automated querying* Do not send automated queries of any sort to Google's system: If you are conducting research on machine translation, optical character recognition or other areas where access to a large amount of text is helpful, please contact us. We encourage the use of public domain materials for these purposes and may be able to help.
+ *Maintain attribution* The Google "watermark" you see on each file is essential for informing people about this project and helping them find additional materials through Google Book Search. Please do not remove it.
+ *Keep it legal* Whatever your use, remember that you are responsible for ensuring that what you are doing is legal. Do not assume that just because we believe a book is in the public domain for users in the United States, that the work is also in the public domain for users in other countries. Whether a book is still in copyright varies from country to country, and we can't offer guidance on whether any specific use of any specific book is allowed. Please do not assume that a book's appearance in Google Book Search means it can be used in any manner anywhere in the world. Copyright infringement liability can be quite severe.

About Google Book Search

Google's mission is to organize the world's information and to make it universally accessible and useful. Google Book Search helps readers discover the world's books while helping authors and publishers reach new audiences. You can search through the full text of this book on the web at `http://books.google.com/`

ARVARD DIVINITY SCHOOL
DOVER-HARVARD THEOLOGICAL
LIBRARY

From the collection
of the
NIVERSALIST HISTORICAL
SOCIETY

MR. WHITMAN'S DISCOURSE.

A

DISCOURSE

ON

DENYING THE LORD JESUS.

BY BERNARD WHITMAN,

OF WALTHAM.

BOSTON,

BOWLES AND DEARBORN, 72 WASHINGTON STREET.

Isaac R. Butts & Co. Printers.

1827.

BX
9842
.W44

Published by the request of the "Second Religious Society" in Waltham.

DISTRICT OF MASSACHUSETTS, *to wit:*
District Clerk's Office.

BE IT REMEMBERED, that on the ninth day of August, A. D. 1827, in the fifty-second year of the Independence of the UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, *Bowles & Dearborn* of the said district, have deposited in this office the title of a book, the right whereof they claim as proprietors, in the words following, *to wit:*

"A Discourse on Denying the Lord Jesus. By Bernard Whitman, of Waltham."

In conformity to the act of the Congress of the United States, entitled "An Act for the encouragement of learning, by securing the copies of maps, charts, and books, to the authors and proprietors of such copies, during the times therein mentioned;" and also to an act entitled "An act supplementary to an act, entitled, an act for the encouragement of learning, by securing the copies of maps, charts and books to the authors and proprietors of such copies during the times therein mentioned; and extending the benefits thereof to the arts of designing, engraving and etching historical and other prints."

JNO. W. DAVIS, } *Clerk of the District of Massachusetts.*

2660
.5

DISCOURSE.

MATTHEW X. 33.

* * * *Whosoever shall deny me before men, him will I also deny before my Father which is in heaven.*

Is there a sincere christian on earth, who would knowingly deny the Lord Jesus? No. I cannot think there is a true believer, in any denomination, who would designedly be guilty of such exceeding sinfulness. But, my friends, are we in no danger of ignorantly denying him? I fear we are. When I observe the weakness, and ignorance, and depravity of mankind; when I witness the mighty influence of prejudice, and interest, and party spirit; when I feel in myself the powerful effects of early instruction, and early impressions, and early associations, I am *compelled* to fear we are in great danger of unintentionally denying the Lord Jesus. Fearing this; and also realizing the value of christian truth; knowing my accountableness to my heavenly Father; and solemnly impressed with the worth of immortal souls, I have selected this infinitely important subject for our present consideration. My inquries will be guided by the sacred scriptures. And I trust you will honestly compare my statements and conclusions with this unerring standard of truth and duty; if they do not coincide with the plain and uniform declarations of inspiration, you are bound to reject them as erroneous; nay, if you receive them as true, you do it on your peril; but if they are in perfect

accordance with the instructions of Moses and the Prophets, Jesus and his Apostles, you are bound to receive them as true; nay, if you reject them as erroneous, you do it on your peril.

You may deny the Lord Jesus in *two* different ways, either in word, or in deed. If you contradict his declarations, you deny him in *word*. If you disobey his commands, you deny him in *deed*. Let us now refer to some of those examples of denial which are recorded for our admonition and warning.

I. An instance of the first kind of denial is found in the tenth chapter of John's Gospel. The Jews accused Jesus of *making himself God!* In so doing they contradicted his declarations; and consequently denied the Lord Jesus.

1. The circumstances were these. Jesus was walking in Solomon's porch. The Jews assembled around him; and wished to know if he was indeed the Christ. He replied that he had already answered their inquiry; and that the works, which he performed in his Father's name, were also sufficient proof of his Messiahship. He then accused them of unbelief, because they were not of his fold. And added, that his sheep should never perish. Why? Because "my Father which gave them me is greater than all; and none is able to pluck them out of my Father's hand. I and my Father are one." Because he uttered these words, the Jews immediately accused him of making himself God. He instantly denied the truth of their charge, in his usual mild and reasoning manner. "Is it not written in your law, 'I said ye are Gods.' If he called them Gods unto whom the word of God came, and the scripture cannot be broken, say ye of *him* whom the Fa-

ther hath sanctified, and sent into the world, thou blasphemest, because I *said* I am the *son* of God ? If I do not the works of my Father, believe me not." In this refutation of their accusation, you notice *three* things. First, he *denied calling himself* God. He had merely called God his Father, and asserted that his Father was greater than all, and then added, I and my Father are one ; not one *person*, for he had uniformly spoken of himself and his Father as two distinct persons ; not one *God*, for he had spoken of *receiving* sheep from the *Father ;* and not one equal being with God, for he had declared that his *Father* was *greater* than *all ;* but simply *one* in affection, and design, and operation. Secondly, he *denied being God.* He asserted that he was *sanctified* and *sent* into the world *by the Father ;* and if he was *dependent* on his Father for his *commission* and *ability* to execute it, he could not be the almighty God. And thirdly, he refuted the charge of blasphemy, from the scriptures. He had called himself the *son* of God. The scriptures had called *men gods*, merely because they received the word of God ; while his miraculous works were sufficient proof of his being *sent* by the Father. Because the Jews perverted the natural meaning of his words, and contradicted his declarations, they denied the Lord Jesus. John x. 23, 37.

2. If you say that Jesus is God, you contradict the declarations of Moses and the Prophets. They speak of one infinite God ; and one Messiah, whom the infinite God would bring into existence, and qualify to be the Saviour of the world. Of his origin and office, a clear intimation is given by Moses. "The *Lord thy God* will *raise up* unto thee *a Prophet* from the midst of thee, of

thy brethren like unto me; unto him shall ye hearken. And *he shall speak* unto them *all that I command* him." In Jesus, this prophecy was literally fulfilled. And if he was a Prophet, made like his brethren, and spoke not his own words, but the commands of his Father, he could not be the infinite God. A still clearer description of him is given by Isaiah. "The *spirit* of the *Lord God* is upon me; because the *Lord hath anointed* me to preach good tidings unto the meek; he *has sent me* to bind up the broken hearted, to proclaim liberty to the captives, and the opening of the prison to them that are bound; to proclaim the acceptable year of the Lord." All this proved true. Jesus received the spirit of the Lord at his baptism; and immediately proclaimed the glad tidings of salvation. To these two prophecies our Saviour referred; as peculiarly descriptive of his person and office. They fairly prove that he was not God; but *wholly dependent* on his Father for *all things.* All the prophecies concerning Christ are of a similar character. In all, he is spoken of as a created, dependent being; and not once as the supreme Jehovah. Jesus came not to destroy the law and prophets; but to fulfil them. If therefore, you say that Jesus is God, you contradict the uniform declarations of Moses and the Prophets; and consequently, you deny the Lord Jesus. Deut. xviii. 15, 18. Isaiah lxi. 12.

3. If you say Jesus is God, you contradict his own declarations. Speaking of God, he said—"The Lord *our* God is *one Lord.*" Did he declare himself to be this one Lord? Let us attend to his teachings. Speaking of himself and his Father, he said—"It is also written in your law, that the testimony of *two* men is true. *I*

am *one* that *beareth witness* of myself; and the *Father* that sent me, *beareth witness* of me." Therefore he and the Father are *two distinct persons.* Speaking of his existence, he said--" As the Father *hath* life in himself, so hath he *given* to the son to have life in himself." If he was dependent on the Father for *existence*, he cannot be the *self-existent* God. Speaking of his continuance, he said—" As the *living* Father hath sent me, and *I live by the Father.*" If he was *dependent* on the Father, for the *preservation of his life*, he cannot be the *independent* God. Speaking of his miraculous powers, he said—" *I can of mine own self do nothing.*" " *The Father* that dwelleth in me *he* doeth the works." If he was wholly *dependent* on his Father for his *power*, he cannot be the *almighty* God. Speaking of his religion, he said—" My *doctrine* is *not mine;* but *his that sent me.*" If he was *dependent* on his Father for his *wisdom*, he cannot be the *only wise* God. Speaking of his goodness, he said—" Why callest thou *me* good; there is none good but *one;* that is *God.*" If he did not possess *infinite goodness*, he cannot be the *perfect* God. Speaking of his knowledge, he said—" Of that day, and that hour, knoweth no *man*, no, not the *angels* which are in heaven, neither the SON, but the Father." If he did *not know all things*, he cannot be the *omniscient* God. If then, you believe his own words, you cannot believe that he is the self-existent, independent, almighty, all wise, all perfect, omniscient God. But to put the question beyond all dispute, he declared in so many words, that his *Father* was *the only true God.* " *Father*—this is life eternal, to know *thee*, THE ONLY TRUE GOD; and Jesus Christ whom *thou hast sent.*" If the Father is the only true

God, then Jesus is not the true God; and is no part of the true God. All these are his own explicit declarations. *All* his instructions are in perfect accordance with these quotations. Not once, did he declare himself to be God. From his own words, therefore, it is *undeniably* proved, that he is not God; but on the contrary, that he is wholly dependent on his Father. If then you say he is God, you contradict his plain, uniform, explicit declarations; and consequently deny the Lord Jesus. Mark xii. 29. John v. 26; vi. 57; v. 30; xiv. 10; vii. 16. Mark x. 18; xiii. 32. John xvii. 13.

4. If you say that Jesus is God, you contradict the declarations of the apostles. They preached Christ to four different classes of hearers; to Jew, and proselytes, and heathen, and converts. Hear how Peter preached Christ to the Jews, on the day of Pentecost. "Ye men of Israel, hear these words; *Jesus* of Nazareth, *a man approved of God* among you, by miracles, and signs, and wonders, which *God did by him* in the midst of you." If God *approved him*, and wrought miracles *by him*, he surely cannot himself be that God. Hear how the same apostle preached Christ to the proselyte Cornelius. "*God anointed Jesus* of Nazareth with the Holy Ghost and with power, who went about doing good, and healing all that were oppressed of the Devil; for *God was with him*. If he was dependent on God for his miraculous powers, he cannot be that God. Hear how Paul preached Christ to the heathen Athenians. God commandeth all men to repent, because he will judge the world "by *that man whom he hath ordained;* whereof he hath given assurance to all men in that he hath raised him from the dead." Not a hint is yet given of his being

God. Hear how the same apostle preached Jesus to christian converts. Unto "us there is *but* ONE GOD, the FATHER, of whom are all things, and we in him; and *one Lord Jesus Christ*, by whom are all things, and we by him." Here is a positive declaration that the Father only is God; and that Jesus is the instrument *by whom* he communicates spiritual blessings. Hear the charge of this same apostle to a young minister of the Gospel. "There is *one God* and *one mediator* between *God* and *men*, *the man Christ Jesus*." Jesus does not mediate between himself and *his* creatures; but between *God* and *his* children. Thus you see that the apostles explicitly declared that Jesus was not God; but a dependent being. All their instructions are in perfect accordance with these quotations. In no instance have they declared Jesus to be the supreme God. Read the Acts of the apostles. This contains the history of their preaching for about thirty years. Examine their discourses carefully, and see, if during this whole period, they even once hinted that Jesus was God. Then read their epistles. When you find a difficult passage, look at the sense and connexion. Interpret obscure sentences by plain ones. And in this way, see if it is even once hinted that Jesus was the infinite God. And can you suppose they would withhold important truth; or inculcate error? No. For Jesus promised them—"Lo I am with *you* always even unto the end of the world," or age. If then you say that Jesus is God, you contradict the plain and uniform declarations of the inspired apostles; and consequently deny the Lord Jesus. Acts ii. 22; x. 38; xvii. 31. 1 Cor. viii. 5. 1 Tim. ii. 5. Matth. xxviii. 20.

5. If you say that Jesus is God, you contradict all the

remarkable facts of his history. God cannot *receive* the holy spirit, but the *spirit was given* to Jesus without measure. God cannot be tempted; but Jesus was tempted in all points as we are. God cannot receive assistance from any being; but an angel strengthened Jesus. God cannot suffer pain; but Jesus suffered exceeding agony. God cannot be *sent* by any one; but Jesus was *sent* by the Father. God cannot be anointed; but Jesus was anointed by God. God cannot be murdered by his dependent creatures; but Jesus was crucified and slain by wicked hands. God cannot *ascend* to any place; but Jesus ascended to his God and Father. God cannot sit at his own right hand; but Jesus is seated at the right hand of God. God cannot pray to any one; but Jesus still prays to his Father. These facts undeniably prove, that Jesus is not God; but on the contrary, that he is dependent on God for all things. And if you say he is God, you contradict all these facts; and, consequently deny the Lord Jesus.

Perhaps you will tell me that the titles, attributes, offices, works, and words of Jesus seem to imply that he is God. Let us now attend to these particulars.

1. You say that Jesus is sometimes called God. True. This name is also given to mere human beings. The Almighty said to Moses—"I have made thee a *God* to Pharaoh. And to the Jews he gave this command—"Thou shalt not revile the *Gods*;" meaning the magistrates. If therefore the application of this title to Jesus proves him to be the infinite God, then Moses and tl magistrates are proved to be infinite Gods. This concl sion, you cannot admit. You must therefore conclu that the name is applied *in an inferior sense to creat*

beings. It is so applied to Jesus. Turn to the first of Hebrews. You say he is there called God. In the very next verse you read these words; "Therefore *God*, even THY GOD, *hath anointed* thee with the oil of gladness *above thy fellows.*" If there was a God above Jesus, by whom he was anointed, surely he could not be that supreme God. And if he was *exalted* over his *fellows*, or *equals*, he must be a dependent being. You see, therefore, that the name God is applied in this place, in an *inferior sense.* And instead of proving Jesus to be God, proves directly the contrary. In Isaiah, you read this sentence. "Unto us a *child is born*—and his name *shall be called*—the *mighty God.*" It does not *read* that this *child*, either *was*, or *is*, or *ever will be*, the mighty *God;* but simply that his *name* should be so *called.* You will find no difficulty in understanding this passage, when you notice the lofty names which the Jews gave, not only to their children, but to places and inanimate objects. Elijah means "God the Lord;" and Jerusalem is called "the Lord our righteousness." But you do not suppose that either this person, or this place, is really Jehovah? Neither can you believe the *child* IS the mighty God. So in *every* instance in which Jesus is called God; a moment's examination will convince you that the name is applied in an *inferior* sense. He is indeed called by the most exalted titles; he has indeed received a name which is above every name; but it "*was given him*" by his God and Father. Those very passages, therefore, in which the highest names are given to Jesus, afford positive proof of his inferiority to the Father. And if you say he is God, you contradict the scripture testimony, and consequently deny the Lord Jesus. Ex. vii. 1; xxii.

28. Heb. i. 9. Isaiah ix. 6. Jeremiah xxxiii. 16. Phil. ii. 9.

A few other passages occur in which the name of God seems, at first view, to be applied to Jesus. Let us give them a fair examination.

In the first of John, you read—"In the beginning was the word, and the word was with God, and the word was God." At first sight, you might think the *word* meant the *son*. But you will be convinced that this is impossible, if you will put *son* in the place of *word*, and *Father* or *Father* and *holy spirit*, in the room of *God*. In the first instance, it will read—In the beginning was the *son*, and the *son* was with the *Father*, and the *son was the Father*. To say the *son was the Father*, is false and absurd. Try the other method. In the beginning was the son, and the son was with the Father and the holy spirit, and the *son was the Father and holy spirit*. This is still worse. To say the *son was the Father and the holy spirit*, is not only false and absurd, but nonsensical. You must therefore conclude the *word* cannot mean the *son* in any sense. And this conclusion may be confirmed by other passages from the same gospel. Only a few verses below, John declares—"No man hath seen *God* at any time;" but the only begotten *son* had declared the Father. If the son was *God*, he had been seen by this very apostle. But he informs us—not that the son was God—or the Father; but that he had manifested the Father's perfections to the world; the Father's wisdom in his instructions, the Father's power in his miraculous works; and the Father's moral goodness in his character; so that whoever had seen the son, had seen all of the Father that could be manifested to mortal

eyes; but the son was not himself that Father, and no part of that Father. John also said that he wrote his Gospel expressly that "ye might believe that *Jesus is the Christ, the son of God.*" If he is the Christ or anointed, he can be no part of that God by whom he was anointed; and if he was the *son* of God, he could not be the God and Father on whom he was dependent for existence. And you cannot think the apostle so inconsistent, as to suppose he would *begin* his history, by asserting that Jesus was God, and *conclude*, by saying he had composed his work to prove directly the contrary; even that Jesus was the anointed son of God? But the plain, unequivocal, assertion of Jesus, that *his Father* was the *only true God*, is sufficient of itself to dispel all doubt on the meaning of this passage. What then is the meaning of the "*word?*" It means the "power of God considered as in action;" that wisdom and power which have ever been with God, even an essential part of himself; and which were displayed in creation, in providence, in the Jewish dispensation; but especially, which dwelt in Jesus, and were manifested in his words and works and character. John i. 1, 18; xx. 31.

In the same Gospel, you find Thomas exclaiming, on seeing the risen Jesus—"my Lord, and my God." At first sight, you might think Thomas called Jesus his God. But imagine yourself in a similar situation. Suppose an endeared friend, whom you had committed to the grave, should stand before you in health? You would naturally exclaim—O my friend, and O my God; first expressing your surprise at seeing your friend invested with life; and then your gratitude to God who had wrought the miracle. This then affords an explanation of the sentence. Thomas first exclaimed, my lord,

meaning Jesus; and then, my God, meaning the Almighty, who the *apostles uniformly affirmed, had raised Jesus from the dead.* And not once have any of them said that God was crucified, or that Jesus raised himself from death. Do you say that Thomas spoke directly to Jesus? So did Jonathan speak directly to David in these words. "And Jonathan said unto David, O Lord God of Israel, when I have sounded my Father." Does this prove David to be the Lord God of Israel? This you cannot admit. Can you then admit that Thomas, educated in the belief of one eternal, spiritual Father, believed that this Lord God of heaven and earth had been crucified, and laid in the grave three days? Why not be consistent; and exercise as much common sense in the former case, as in the latter? Then you will come to the conclusion, that the word God, in this passage, does not belong to Jesus in any sense. John xx. 8. 1 Sam. xx. 12.

In the book of Acts, you read these words—"to feed the church of *God* which he hath purchased with his own blood." In this passage the word *God*, should be changed to the word *Lord.* For *Lord* is the true meaning of the *original* Greek word. You could not, however, be led into error by the verse as it now stands. For you would recollect that *God* is a *spirit;* and can have neither *flesh* nor *blood.* Especially would you remember that the infinite *Creator* could not be murdered by his dependent creatures. You would therefore conclude, either that the word God was applied to Jesus in an *inferior* sense, or was a mistranslation. Acts xx. 28.

In the Epistle to the Romans, you find this sentence—"Whose are the Father's, and of whom, as concerning the flesh, Christ came; who is over all, God blessed, for-

ever." At first sight, you might think Paul declared that Jesus was God. But you will be convinced to the contrary, if you look at the sense and connexion. Paul said Christ was a regular descendant of the Israelites. This is plain. Now could he say in the same breath, that THIS JEWISH DESCENDANT WAS GOD ALMIGHTY? Can you believe the inspired apostle would utter such an absurdity? Perhaps you will say that he spoke of his human nature, because he used the phrase—"as concerning the flesh." Very well. I take you on your own ground. In the verse but one above, Paul speaks of his "*kinsmen according to the flesh.*" Had his kinsmen two natures? If you cannot admit this, you cannot consistently admit that this phrase means any thing more than *natural descent.* In this last sense, and in no other, is it ever used by the sacred writers. Now you must conclude, either that the apostle declared a regular descendant of the Jews was God Almighty—a shocking absurdity, or that he did not call Christ God? What then is the true meaning of the sentence? Look at the train of thought the apostle was pursuing. He was speaking of the Jews, the favored people, who had received from God peculiar blessings, the adoption, the glory, the covenant, the services, the promises, the prophetic Fathers. In all these ways had they been blessed by God; the prophets, peculiarly blessed with miraculous powers; but Christ, a regular descendant, blessed above them all; *Christ, who is blessed by God—or God-blessed, over them all, forever;* OVER ALL, GOD-BLESSED, *in being exalted to be a prince and a Saviour; and God-blessed* FOREVER; for the time can never come when he shall be inferior to any created being; it having pleased the Father to give him the pre-eminence in all things.

In this way, the passage contains a rational, natural, consistent, important meaning. If, therefore, you would make the apostle consistent with himself and common sense, even in this one sentence, and especially with all his other writings, you must conclude the word God, in this place, does not mean Jesus. Rom. ix. 3, 6.

In an epistle to Timothy, you read these words—"*God* manifest in the flesh." In this passage the word *God* should be changed to the words, "*he who.*" This is the correct translation of the *original* Greek word. The sentence, however, as it now reads, would not lead you into error. For it asserts that the person who was manifested in the flesh, "was justified in the spirit;" and also, "received up into glory." Now to say that God was received up into glory, is an absurdity. For he was never out of glory; he fills immensity; he is in all places, and in all places glorious and infinitely happy. You would, therefore, conclude, either that the word God was used for Jesus, in an *inferior* sense, or that it was a mistranslation. 1 Tim. iii. 16.

In the first epistle of John, you find this passage. "We know that the *son* of God is come, and hath given us an understanding, that we may know *Him that is true;* and we are in *him* that is true—in his son Jesus Christ. *This* is the *true God* and *eternal life.*" At first view, you might think *this* referred to Jesus, and if so, he would be called the true God. But a moment's attention will convince you to the contrary. For by *Him that is true* must be meant God—the Father. Then if you refer *this* to Jesus, you make him the true God; and you shut out the Father from being any part of God. This would be false and absurd. You therefore see that *this cannot* refer to *Jesus;* but, to *him that is true*—even

God the Father, whom Jesus declared to be the only true God. If the word had been *these* instead of *this*, it might have included both; but as the apostle has left it, the Father is declared to be the true God. Do you say the word *this usually* refers to the *nearest* antecedent? True. But we do not expect perfect grammatical accuracy in "unlettered" men. John uses the same word in a similar sense in the next epistle. "For many deceivers are entered into the world, who confess not that Jesus Christ is come in the flesh. *This* is a *deceiver* and an *antichrist*." In this passage, if you make *this* refer to the *nearest* antecedent, it will refer to *Jesus;* and make *him* the *deceiver* and *antichrist*. Are you willing to admit this conclusion? No. You know better. Then be consistent; lest the character either of self-deceiver, or something worse, fall upon yourself. You must, therefore, conclude that the word God, in this place, does not refer to Jesus in any sense. 1 John v. 20. 2 John 7.

The last passage I shall notice is this. "For there are three that bear record in heaven, the Father, the word, and the holy Ghost; and these three are one." I presume it is known to most of you that this verse was not written by John; that it is no part of the true Bible; that it was put into one manuscript by some wicked person many years after the apostle's death; and in this way came in our English translation. But it is now given up by all persons who make the least pretensions to biblical criticism. It is, therefore, unnecessary for me to quote the opinions, or even the names of the many learned trinitarian writers, who have satisfactorily proved this passage to be no part of the true Bible. A distinguished trinitarian writer in the Eclectic Review, the standard periodical of

the orthodox party in England, expresses himself on this question in these words. "Under these circumstances, we are UNSPEAKABLY ASHAMED that any *modern* divines should have fought for the retention of a passage so INDISPUTABLY SPURIOUS." To this expression of orthodox sentiment, I respond a hearty amen. And will only add, that I am *unspeakably ashamed* that any *modern* divine should quote a passage so *indisputably spurious*, as a part *of revelation.* 1 John v. 7.

I think I have noticed all the verses which can give you the least trouble in explanation. Let obscure sentences be interpreted by the multitude of plain ones. And do not found your faith upon unintelligible or disconnected sentences.

2. You say that Jesus declared—"I am Alpha and Omega; *the beginning* and *the end.*" True. But of what is he *the beginning?* Let his own words answer. "These things saith the amen, the faithful and true witness, *the beginning of the creation of God.*" Very well. If he is *the beginning of God's creation*, he cannot be the God by whom he was created. And of what is he *the end?* Let Paul answer. "Then cometh *the end*, when he—Jesus—*shall have delivered up the kingdoms to* GOD, *even the* FATHER; when he shall have put down all rule and all authority and power. For *he must reign till he hath put all enemies under his feet.*—But when he saith all things are put under him, it is manifest that *he is excepted which did put all things under him.* And when all things shall be subdued unto him, then shall the *son also himself be subject unto him* that put all things under him, that *God* may be *all* and *in all.*" Very well. If *his kingdom is to end*, then Jesus is THE END OF THE

GOSPEL DISPENSATION; THE END, AS well as THE BEGINNING. These passages, therefore, explain our Saviour's declaration; and instead of proving him to be God, they *undeniably* prove that he is a created being; that he is dependent on God for all his power; that he will reign until all rational creatures are subdued to God; that he will then deliver up his kingdom to the Father, and, like other intelligent beings, become *subject* to his paternal authority. If you contradict such decisive testimony, you, in effect, deny the Lord Jesus. Rev. xxii. 13; iii. 14. 1 Cor. xv. 24—28.

3. You say that Jesus is to judge the world. True. But what does this prove? Paul said to his converts—"Do ye not know that *saints* shall judge the *world?* Know ye not that *we* shall judge *angels?*" Does this prove Paul and the saints to be Gods? No. Then the office of judge does not prove Jesus to be God. But let his own words explain this subject. "The Father judgeth no man; but hath *committed* all judgment unto the *son.*" If the son is dependent on his Father for his commission, he cannot be the independent God; for nothing can be *committed* to the infinite Jehovah. And why does the Father "*give him authority to execute judgment?*" Hear his answer. "*Because he is the son of man.*" Yes. Because Jesus is the son of man, and was made ike his brethren, and could be touched with a feeling of their infirmities; and not because he is God, and can know the secrets of all hearts. But if he be not omniscient, how can he possess sufficient knowledge to execute his commission? Hear his own answer. "*I can of mine own self do nothing;* AS I HEAR I JUDGE." If he must *hear* from his Father before he can pronounce

sentence, he cannot be the omniscient God. From his own words, therefore, it is plainly proved, that he is wholly dependent on his Father for his commission, and his ability to execute his trust; and that he is appointed to this office because he is the son of man. The apostles *uniformly* preached the same sentiments. Read their discourses and letters with a special reference to this subject. Peter addressed Cornelius in these words. God commanded us to testify that it is Jesus which "*was ordained of God to be the judge* of the quick and dead." This is the plain, uniform, unembarrassed doctrine of revelation. God is the supreme judge of the universe; Jesus is the instrument, the commissioned judge, by whom he judges this world. And if you say that Jesus is God, because he is to judge the world, you contradict his explicit declarations; you deny the Lord Jesus. 1 Cor. vi. 2, 3. John v. 22, 30. Acts x. 42.

4. You say that Jesus forgave sins. True. And so did the apostles, if they were faithful in executing their commission. For Jesus said to them—"Whosesoever sins ye remit, they are remitted; and whosesoever sins ye retain, they are retained." Are the apostles Gods, because they had power to forgive sins? No. Then Jesus is not God. But let this subject be fully explained by his own words. The Jews accused him of blasphemy, because he said to one sick of the palsy—"Thy sins be forgiven thee." Jesus refuted their charge in his reasoning manner. "Whether *is easier*, to say, *thy sins be forgiven thee;* or to say, *arise and walk?* But that *ye may know that* the *son of man hath power on earth to forgive sins.*" His words may be thus paraphrased. Does it require any greater power to forgive sins than to

heal diseases? I pronounced forgiveness, that ye might know I possessed power to forgive sins, as well as work miracles. But I am not guilty of blasphemy; for I did this act as the son of man; and not as God, from whom I receive all my power. In this sense was his answer understood by the hearers. For the apostle adds—"When the multitude saw it, they marvelled, and *glorified God*, which *had given such power* unto men." It is therefore evident, from the very words of Jesus, that he was dependent on God for his power to forgive sins. And this is the current doctrine of scripture. And if you contradict such divine testimony, you deny the Lord Jesus. Matth. ix. 5, 8. John xx. 23.

5. You say that Jesus wrought miracles. True. And so did Moses, the prophets, and the apostles. Does this prove them to be Gods? No. Neither does it prove Jesus to be God. Let us attend to his own words on this subject. "When ye have lifted up the son of man, then shall ye know that I am he, and *that I do nothing of myself.* The *works which the Father hath given me to perform*, testify of me that *the Father hath sent me.*" This must be satisfactory; must convince every fair mind that he was *wholly dependent* on his Father for miraculous powers; and *always* dependent. For when he performed his greatest miracle, he thus prayed. "Father, I thank thee that *thou hast heard me.* And I know that *thou hearest me* ALWAYS; but *because* of the people that stand by *I said* it, that they may *believe* that thou *hast sent me.*" If his Father *heard* him ALWAYS, then he *always prayed.* In this instance he uttered his prayer aloud—why? That the people might believe—what?—that he could work miracles by his own power?

—that he was God?—No. Directly the reverse. That he was *sent* by the God of heaven; and dependent on him for his miraculous powers. And such is the uniform and oft-repeated sentiment of his guileless lips. And if you contradict his unequivocal declarations, you deny the Lord Jesus. John vi. 38; v. 36; xi. 41.

6. You say that Jesus declared—"I and my Father are one." True. He also declared that husband and wife were no more *two* but "*one flesh.*" Do you take this expression in its *literal* sense; and really believe that the married couple are but *one person?* Or do you exercise your common sense; and conclude they are, or ought to be *one* in *affection* and *design?* In what sense then are *Jesus* and the *Father one?* Let his own words explain. "Holy Father, keep through thy own name those whom thou hast given me, that *they* may be *one,* AS WE ARE. Neither pray I for these alone, but for *them also* which shall believe on me through their word; that THEY ALL may be ONE; AS *thou Father art in me, and I in thee, that* THEY ALSO *may be* ONE *in* US." No clearer explanation of our Saviour's declaration need be given. He prays that his apostles, and all Christians, may be *one* with him and his Father; *in the same manner as he and the Father are one;* that is, *one* in affection, design, spirit, operation; and not *one person,* nor *one God.* If therefore you quote this saying of Jesus to prove that he is God, on the same grounds you may prove that the apostles and all Christians are God. But if you do this, you contradict the plain meaning of our Saviour's words; and consequently deny the Lord Jesus. John x. 30. Matth. xix. 5. John xvii. 11, 21.

7. You say that Jesus associated his name with his

Father's in the formula of baptism. True. But what does this prove? If being baptized into the name of any person proves that one to be God, then is Moses proved to be God. For all the Israelites "were baptized into Moses in the cloud and in the sea." And if associating the name of any one with God proves the person to be God, then are the Prophets proved to be *Gods*. For the Jews were commanded to "*believe the Lord God*," and "*his Prophets*." Then these circumstances will not prove Jesus to be God. Now turn to the place in which Jesus commissioned his apostles. You see he took all necessary pains to prevent every one from inferring that he was any part of God, merely because his name was associated with his Father's. For he begins his address in these words. "All power *is given* unto me in heaven and in earth." If all power *was given* him, there must have been a time when it was not in his possession. And if so, he could not be the eternal God; for God must have had all power from eternity. And if any thing could *be given* to Jesus, he could not be God; for nothing can be given to the *original possessor of all things*. And if power was given to Jesus by his Father, he must be a dependent being; dependent on his Father for this gift. All this is plain; so plain, that if any one cannot draw this simple conclusion from our Saviour's words, he cannot be answerable for his opinions. The apostles, however, understood the meaning of his words. And if you will turn to their first and their last sermons, you will learn how they explained their commission. Instead of declaring, that there was one God, the Father, son, and holy spirit; they *uniformly* declared that there was but one God, the Father; that he *had raised* up Je-

sus to be a Saviour; and that he had wrought miracles *by him*, with his holy spirit, to convince the world of his Messiahship. So that this passage, instead of proving Jesus to be God, proves him to be dependent for his power on his God and Father. And it is truth to declare, that the names, attributes, offices, works, and words of Jesus, instead of proving him to be God, afford the most satisfactory evidence of his inferiority to the Father; and his dependence on him for these very names, offices, works and words.

What then must be our conclusion. The testimony of the Bible is uniform and consistent. It proves that there is but one God, the Father. It also proves that Jesus is the *son* of God; a distinct being from his Father; and wholly dependent on him for his existence, his preservation, his power, his wisdom, and knowledge. If, therefore, I act like a rational being, and submit to reasonable, scriptural evidence, I must conclude, that Jesus is not the supreme God. And as an honest man, I *dare* not reject this conclusion. I *dare* not contradict the explicit declarations of Moses and the Prophets, Jesus and the apostles. And when Jesus unequivocally declares, that the Father is the only true God, I *dare* not accuse him of uttering falsehood. I *dare* not unite with the Jews in accusing him of making himself God. For I would not knowingly deny the Lord Jesus.

II. Another instance of the first kind of denial is recorded in the fifth chapter of John's gospel. The Jews accused Jesus of *making himself equal with God!* By so doing, they contradicted his declarations; and consequently denied the Lord Jesus.

1. The circumstances were these. Jesus healed an impotent man on the sabbath day. This so enraged the Jews, that they sought to take his life. He defended his benevolent deed with this observation. "My Father worketh hitherto, and I work." They immediately accused him of *making himself equal with God!* He quickly denied the truth of their accusation, with his strongest affirmation. "Verily, verily, I say unto you, the SON *can do nothing of himself.*" A more explicit, direct, positive denial, he could not have given. For if *the son can do nothing of himself*, he surely cannot be equal with God, who can of himself do all things. In substance, therefore, Jesus declared that he had not made himself equal with God; and that he was not his equal in any sense; because he could do nothing without his assistance. The Jews contradicted the natural meaning of his words; and consequently denied the Lord Jesus. John v. 17, 19.

2. If you say that Jesus is equal with God, you contradict the declarations of Moses and the Prophets. By the word *God*, when applied to the supreme Being, I understand one uncreated, underived, self-existent, eternal, all-perfect, all-pervading spirit. To say this infinite being is equal with himself, is perfect nonsense. If then you say that Jesus is equal to *God*, he must be a *second* uncreated, underived, self-existent, eternal, all-perfect, all-pervading spirit; and consequently, a second Deity. But the infinite God declared "*I* am *God*, and there is *none* else." If Jesus is equal with God he must also be *with* him, filling immensity. But the infinite God declared—"There is no God *with* me." If Jesus is equal with God, he must likewise be *like* him. But

the infinite God declared—"I am God, there is none else, none *like* me." If then you place confidence in the words of the Almighty, you cannot believe there is any infinite being *equal* to the one true God; or *with* the one true God; or *like* the one true God. And when Jesus was baptized, the infinite God declared from heaven—"This is my beloved *son* in whom I am well pleased." This is conclusive evidence that Jesus is a distinct being from the infinite God; and also, that he is no *third* part, no *equal* part, *no part*, of the infinite God; but truly the *son* of God. And so he is represented throughout the old Testament; the messiah, the anointed, the redeemer, the sun of righteousness, the prince of peace, whom the infinite God would bring into existence, and qualify to be the Saviour of the world. And not in one instance is it even hinted that he should be equal to the eternal Jehovah. If then you say that Jesus is equal with God, you contradict the uniform declarations of the ancient Prophets; and consequently deny the Lord Jesus. Isaiah xlv. 22. Deut. xxxii. 39. Isaiah xlvi. 9. Matth. iv. 17.

3. If you say that Jesus is equal with God, you contradict his own declarations. All his sayings, which I have already quoted to prove that he is not God, also prove that he is not equal with God. For they prove that he is not self-existent, independent, omnipotent, infinitely wise and good, and omniscient. And if he does not possess any or all of these attributes, as he explicitly declared he did not; he cannot be equal to the eternal God. Besides these, other passages may be produced. Speaking of himself, he said—"I am the *son* of God." If he is a *son*, he must depend on a *Father* for existence; for

no son can exist without a Father. And if dependent for existence, then for all things. This proves his own words literally true. "The *son* can do *nothing* of *himself*." Consequently he cannot be *equal* with the Father who gave him being and all his powers. It is unnecessary to multiply quotations. Passages, which declare or imply his inferiority to his Father, are found in almost every discourse he uttered. As if to put this question at rest forever, he unequivocally declared—"My Father is greater than I." This declaration cannot possibly be misunderstood. It cannot possibly admit of but one meaning. It cannot possibly be explained away. If you admit its truth, you must admit that Jesus is not so great as his Father; is not equal with God. *All* his teachings are in perfect accordance with this sentiment; not once has he even hinted that he is equal with God. And if you say he is, you contradict his explicit, uniform declarations; and consequently deny the Lord Jesus. John x. 36; viii. 42; xiv. 28.

4. If you say that Jesus is equal with God, you contradict the declarations of the apostles. On the day of pentecost, Peter proclaimed—that God "*made Jesus both Lord and Christ.*" If he was *made* Lord, he could not be *equal* to his *perfect Maker*. The same apostle, in the name of his apostolic brethren, also declared; that "God *exalted* Jesus to be a prince and a Saviour." If he was *exalted* by God, he could not be his equal; for it is impossible for any being to be *raised* higher than God; and it is absurd to suppose, that God would exalt an equal above himself, even were it possible. And if he was exalted to be a *Saviour*, he is dependent on God for his office. He is, therefore, the instrument, the delegated son, the commissioned saviour, *by whom* the Sovereign of the

universe saves our world. Paul taught his converts that Jesus was "*the first born of many brethren.*" If he was born in any sense, he cannot be equal to the Father who caused his birth. And if he has many brethren, he cannot be equal with God, unless there are many equal Gods. John asks—"Who is a liar, but he that denyeth that *Jesus* is the *Christ.*" If he be Christ, he cannot be equal with God. For the words *Christ* and *Messiah* mean *anointed;* and when applied to Jesus, mean anointed with the holy spirit. And if Jesus was the Christ, was thus anointed, he cannot be equal to the God from whom he received the spirit without measure. Such are a few specimens of apostolic preaching. All their instructions are of a similar character. Not once, have they said that Jesus was equal with God; but, on the contrary, they have uniformly represented him as receiving his existence, his miraculous powers, his resurrection from death, his exaltation, and his heavenly reward, from God, his Father. And if you say he was equal with God, you contradict the apostolic declarations; and consequently, deny the Lord Jesus. Acts ii. 36; v. 31. Rom. viii. 29.

Perhaps you will tell me that some passages are found which seem to imply that Jesus is equal with God. Let us now give them a fair examination.

1. In the first of Colossians, Jesus is said to be "the image of the invisible God." This passage explains itself. In the *same sentence*, he is also declared to be "*the first born of every creature.*" If, therefore, he is a "*creature,*" he can neither be God, the *Creator;* nor *equal* to the *Father*, who *gave him existence* and all his powers. Col. i. 15.

2. In the first of Hebrews, Jesus is said to be "the

express image of his—God's—person." This passage also explains itself. In the *same sentence*, he is also declared to be "*made* so much *better* than the *angels*, as he hath by inheritance *obtained* a more *excellent name* than they." If therefore he is the *image* of God, he cannot be the God of whom he is the image. And if he is *made better than the angels*, he cannot be equal to the omnipotent *Maker* of *himself* and all things. Heb. i. 3, 4.

3. In the epistle to the Colossians, you read this passage. "For in him dwelt all the fulness of the Godhead bodily." What is the meaning of this sentence? It *cannot* mean that Jesus was either the eternal God, or equal with his infinite Father. For it expressly declares, that the fulness of God—or Godhead—dwelt really in Jesus. What is the fulness of God? Let Paul explain his own writings. He prays to the *Father* of Jesus, that his Ephesian converts "*might be filled with all the fulness of God.*" Did he pray that they might become Gods; or equal with God? No. But simply that they might have an abundance of divine wisdom and spiritual gifts. This then was the fulness which dwelt in Jesus; the spirit was given to him without measure, and dwelt in him, enabling him to work miracles, and speak as man never spake before. But how came he by this fulness? Let the apostle answer. "*For it pleased the Father that in him should all fulness dwell.*" Very well. If he was dependent on his Father for all the fulness of the Godhead, he was neither God, nor equal to the giver of his spiritual treasures. This text, therefore, instead of proving Jesus to be either God, or equal with God, proves him to be a dependent being; dependent on the Father for all the miraculous powers he possessed. Col. ii. 9. Eph. iii. 19. Col. i. 19.

4. In the epistle to the Philippians, it is said that Jesus "thought it not robbery to be equal with God." This passage likewise explains itself. Let me quote the whole sentence. "*Let this mind be in you, which was also in Christ Jesus;* who, being in the form of God, thought it not robbery to be equal with God; but made himself of no reputation, and took upon him the form of a servant, and was made in the likeness of man; and being found in fashion as a man, he *humbled himself*, and *became obedient unto death*, even the death of the cross; wherefore *God* also *hath highly exalted* him; and *given him a name* which is above every name; that *at the name of Jesus* every knee should bow, of things in heaven, and things in the earth, and things under the earth; and that every tongue should confess *that Jesus Christ is Lord*, to the *glory of God the Father*." Now, by looking at the whole connexion, you see at once, that Paul could not possibly intend to convey the idea of Jesus being equal with God. For in the first place, he uniformly speaks of Jesus as a being distinct from God, and wholly dependent on him. In the second place, he speaks of Jesus *humbling* himself, becoming obedient to *death*, being highly *exalted*, *receiving* the most lofty *name*, and of worship being offered—*not to him*, but simply *in his name, solely for the glory of his God and Father*. Now you well know, that neither *God*, nor an *equal with God*, could either *humble* himself, or *die*, or be *exalted*, or *receive* a more glorious *name;* and you also know that an equal of God would be entitled to *equal worship;* but in this place *all worship* is to be offered *in the name of Jesus* to the *glory of God the Father;* so that no religious homage is given to the *son*. And in the third place, you perceive that Paul is inculcating humility upon his con-

verts, from the example of Jesus. "Let this mind be in you which was also in Christ Jesus." Now can you believe, that when the apostle is exhorting his brethren, *to think of others more highly than themselves*, he would mention as an instance of Christ's humility, *that* HE *did not think his own Father higher than himself;* that HE *thought it nothing wrong to claim an equality with the infinite Jehovah!* A singular way indeed of promoting humility; and making Christians of the *same mind* with Christ. No. No, you will not attribute such absurdities to the pen of the inspired Paul. What then must we do? Does not the passage read, that "he thought it not robbery to be equal with God?" In our translation, it does. But you should remember that this epistle was written in the Greek language. And you may know that scholars of all parties agree that our translation of this sentence is not correct. What then is the true rendering? The literal meaning of the Greek words is this. "*He did not think of the robbery, the being like God.*" Although created in the express image of God, he did not think of the robbery of being like God; did not think of the robbery of claiming an equality with his Father; but humbled himself; so that God has highly exalted him, even at his right hand. This makes the apostle consistent and sensible, and even powerful. This passage, therefore, contains positive evidence that Jesus is not equal with God; nay, that he never thought of the presumption of claiming equality with his heavenly Father. Phil. ii. 5, 11.

What then must be our conclusion? The Old Testament does not contain *one* passage in which it is either declared or implied, that the son is equal with God. On the contrary, it is its uniform testimony, that God has no

equal, and also that the son is wholly dependent on him for all things. The New Testament does not furnish *one* passage, in which it is either declared, or implied that the son is equal with God. On the contrary, it contains above three hundred passages, in which it is either positively declared or clearly implied, that he is inferior to his Father. If then I am governed by reasonable evidence, I must conclude that Jesus is not equal with God. And as an honest man I *dare* not reject this conclusion. I dare not contradict the uniform testimony of the whole Bible. When Jesus declared in so many words —"My Father is greater than I,"—I *dare* not accuse him of uttering falsehood. I dare not unite with the Jews in accusing him of making himself equal with God. For I would not knowingly deny the Lord Jesus.

III. An instance of the second kind of denial is contained in the twenty second chapter of the book of Revelation. The apostle John fell down before the risen Jesus, to *offer him the religious worship which is due only to God.* By so doing he disobeyed the commands of his master; and *unintentionally* denied the Lord Jesus.

1. The circumstances were these. "God *gave* unto Jesus" a revelation. Jesus communicated the same to the beloved John, sometimes in person, and sometimes by messengers. John was so transported with what he saw and heard, that he fell down to offer him religious worship. Jesus instantly forbade him, in these words; "*See thou do it not;* for I am thy fellow *servant*, and of *thy brethren* the Prophets, and of them which *keep the sayings of this book;* WORSHIP GOD." The different names, by which he distinguishes himself, are the same as he used before his crucifixion. Let me quote merely

one specimen. "Behold *my servant* whom I have chosen." "Go tell *my brethren* that they go into Galilee." "If ye keep my commandments, ye shall abide in my love; even as I *have kept my Father's commandments*, and abide in his love. By turning to the passage in question, you will notice that Jesus is called "*the angel.*" The word angel means messenger; and in the Revelation the name is given to Jesus, as in the first verse of the first chapter and elsewhere; to spiritual beings, as in many chapters; and to John, as in the sixteenth verse of the twenty second chapter. You can determine the person, to whom it is applied in any particular place, by examining the sense and connexion. You perceive that Jesus resumes the conversation in the sixth verse of the twenty second chapter. For in the seventh he says, "Behold I come quickly;" in the tenth, he says, "seal not the sayings of the prophecy of this book;" and in the sixteenth, he says—"I Jesus have sent mine angel," meaning John, to testify to the churches. And before this verse, he calls himself "the beginning and the end;" so that you cannot have the shadow of a doubt, that Jesus forbade John to offer him religious worship, although he is in this place, as in many others, called an angel, or God's messenger. And as this prohibition is in perfect accordance with his other commands, John's disobedience made him guilty of *unintentionally* denying the Lord Jesus. Rev. xxii. 6, 21. Matth. xi. 18; xxviii. 16. John xv. 10.

2. If you worship Jesus as God, you disobey the instruction of Moses and the Prophets. They taught by precept and example. They have recorded the commands of God. The first is this. "Thou shalt have no other Gods before *me.*" You will not pretend that these words proceeded from Jesus. They came from the

same Being who promised to raise up a Saviour. Yo will also notice that the word *me* can mean but one *pe son*. And you will remember that this *one person* sai by his servant—"Thou shalt worship no other God; f the Lord is a jealous God." If then you worship Jesus a God, you disobey the first great command, and hav another God besides your heavenly Father. This com mand was, however, literally obeyed by the ancient wo thies. Look at their example. "And Hezekiah praye before the Lord, and said, O Lord God of Israel, *thou a the God*, even *thou alone*." This prayer is not addres ed to the Son; but to *one* God, in *one person*. All th commands and examples of the Old Testament are i perfect accordance with the specimens quoted. The an cient Jews uniformly worshipped one God in one person their modern descendants, in imitation of their exam ple, still adhere to the plain commands of their scripture If therefore you worship Jesus as God, you disobey th instruction of Moses and the Prophets; and consequen ly deny the Lord Jesus. Ex. xx. 3. xxxiv. 14. 2 King xix. 15.

3. If you worship Jesus as God, you disobey his ow instruction. He also taught by example and precep Many specimens of his prayers are contained in th gospels. In a season of joy, he ejaculated—"I than thee, O *Father*, Lord of heaven and earth." When h received assistance to perform his greatest miracle, h said, "*Father*, I thank thee that thou *hast heard* me And I know that thou hearest me *always*." In an hou of agony, he prayed, "*Father*, if thou be willing re move this cup from me." In the moment of death, h exclaimed, "*Father*, into thy hand I commend my spir it." You notice that his prayers were uniformly address

ed to the FATHER. Not an instance can you find, in which he prayed, either to himself, or the holy spirit, or any being but his God and Father. As he practised, so he preached. His disciples requested him to teach them to pray. "When ye pray, say *our Father* which art in heaven." He never hinted that he was himself that Father, or any part of that Father, to whom he directed them to offer their devotions. Could he either ignorantly or designedly lead them into error on this most important subject? Far from our minds be the base suspicion. Soon after, he informed the woman of Samaria, that the time had arrived, "when the *true* worshippers shall worship the *Father* in spirit and in truth." If you worship any being but the Father, you are not the *true* worshippers; for he alone is *the only* proper object of worship. "Thou shalt worship the Lord thy God, and *him only* shalt thou serve." But to prevent all mistake, he explicitly forbade worship to himself. "In that day"—after my ascension —"YE SHALL ASK ME NOTHING." A more positive prohibition could not have been given. Not in one instance has he commanded any one to worship either himself, or the spirit, or any being, but his FATHER; the ONLY TRUE GOD. On this all important subject, therefore, his instructions are peculiarly plain, and explicit, and definite. And if you worship him as God, you disobey his uniform example and commands, and consequently, you deny the Lord Jesus. Luke x. 21; xxii. 42; xxiii. 46; xi. 2. John iv. 23. Matth. iv. 10. John xvi. 23.

4. If you worship Jesus as God, you disobey the instructions of the Apostles. They likewise taught by example and precept. While Jesus remained on earth, they worshipped the Father only, in obedience to his instructions. Soon after his ascension, they "lifted up

their voice to God with *one accord*, and said, Lord, thou art God, which hast made the heavens, and earth, and the sea, and all that in them is;" "of a truth against *thy holy child Jesus* whom *thou hast anointed*, both Herod and Pontius Pilate were gathered together." This prayer is offered to the God whom Jesus taught them to worship; to his God and Father. Take an example from their epistles. Paul, who was caught up to the third heaven, and, of course, ought to know the proper object of worship, declared, "I bow my knees to the *Father* of our Lord Jesus Christ." Peter prayed, "Blessed be the *God* and *Father* of our Lord Jesus Christ," James said, speaking of the tongue—"Therewith bless we *God*, even the *Father*." John said—"Grace be with you from *God the Father*." Jude begins his epistle with the mention of "*God* the *Father*." It was their uniform practice to worship the Father of Jesus, and him only, as the supreme God. And no instance of their worshipping Jesus as God, can be found in their writings. They preached as they practised. When addressing Jews, they inculcated no new object of worship. For the Jews already worshipped the God of their Fathers; the one true God of heaven and earth. When addressing Cornelius, they gave him no command to worship Jesus, but permitted him to continue in the worship of the one impartial Father of the universe. When addressing the learned, idolatrous, Athenians, they explained to them the only proper object of religious worship. But it was not Jesus; it was the infinite Father who *had raised Jesus from the* dead, and *ordained him to be the judge of the world*. When addressing christian converts, Paul said, "Whatsoever ye do in word or deed, do all *in the name* of the Lord Jesus, *giving thanks* to *God* and *the Father by*

him." It is unnecessary to multiply quotations. They uniformly represented the Father—God—as the *only* proper object of religious worship. In no instance have they directed any one to worship either the Son, or the spirit, or any being but God the Father. And if you worship Jesus as God, you disobey all apostolic instruction; and consequently deny the Lord Jesus. Acts iv. 24, 27. Eph. iii. 14. 1 Pet. i. 3. James i. 3. 2 John 3. Col. iii. 17.

Perhaps you will tell me, that Jesus was worshipped while on earth. True. But not in one instance as God. In the Scriptures, the word worship has two distinct meanings; first, religious homage due only to God; and secondly, obeisance, civil respect, grateful reverence. This definition may be illustrated by a few quotations. "And all the congregation—bowed down their heads, and *worshipped* the *Lord* and the *king*." They worshipped the Lord with religious homage; and the king with civil respect. "King Nebuchadnezzar fell down upon his face, and *worshipped* Daniel." Nothing more than civil obeisance. Our Saviour, in relating a parable, said —"The servant therefore fell down and *worshipped* him;" not as God, with religious homage; but as a benefactor, with grateful reverence. Quotations of this kind might be largely multiplied. But sufficient have been given to illustrate the different meanings of the word worship. Now the plain fact is this. In those countries, where the holy Scriptures were written, respect and reverence were shown to superiors and benefactors by falling down and worshipping them. In the eastern nations, this custom still prevails. When any one approaches the presence of the king of China, he must fall down and *worship* him nine times. This kind

of worship was frequently offered to Jesus, especially by such as were benefited by his miraculous powers. It was first done by the wise men, who brought him offerings of gold and spices. No one can be so senseless as to suppose they adored the tender infant as the infinite God! No. They paid their respects to a child, who was ordained by God to become a Prince and a Saviour. When he stilled the winds and waves, his disciples worshipped him. But not as God; for they said in so many words, "of a truth thou art the *Son* of God." And you well recollect, that he directed those whom he cured to give all glory to his heavenly Father. In all the examples on record, it does not appear that religious homage was intended, even in *one* instance. Consequently, there was no occasion for his forbidding such reverence; more especially, since the praise was given to "God who had given such power" to his Son. But had one attempted to offer him the worship due only to God, he would have forbidden the act, as quickly as he did in the case of John; for he was exceedingly tenacious of his Father's glory. Hence you see the cause why Paul and Barnabas forbade the worship of the inhabitants of Lystra. These idolaters were proceeding to offer sacrifices to them as heathen deities. And even Cornelius was not so free from heathen notions, but Peter was obliged to say to him, "I myself also am a *man*." Although Jesus was never worshipped as God while on earth, yet he requires us to honor him as we do his Father. And this we do, when we acknowledge him as the commissioned *Son* of God; and receive his instructions as the *wisdom* of God; and obey his precepts as the *commands* of God; and *not* when we offer him the religious homage due only to his heavenly Father, in direct disobedience

to his explicit injunctions. 1 Chron—xxix. 20. Dan. ii. 46; Matth. xviii. 26; xiv. 23. Acts x. 26; xiv. 14.

After the ascension of Jesus, I find no instance of his being worshipped as God. Stephen, indeed, called upon him to receive his departing spirit. But not as God. For the Scripture explicitly informs us that he saw "*Jesus standing on the right hand of God;*" so that he could not possibly mistake the one standing on the right hand of God for God himself. And accordingly he called upon Jesus—not God*—as his risen Lord. All this was proper. For a special miracle was wrought to confirm the faith and constancy of this first christian martyr. And when the opening heavens disclosed to his failing sight his ascended Saviour, how natural for him to breathe his soul into his hands. Should a similar miracle be wrought at the hour of our dissolution, it would be proper and natural for us to imitate this example; but under no other circumstances. For we are required to imitate the example of Jesus, who said—"Father, into thy hand I commend my spirit;" but no where is the example of Stephen recommended to our imitation. In this passage, therefore, Jesus was not worshipped as God; and no encouragement is given for any one to call upon him, except in case of a similar miracle. In Paul's epistle to the Corinthians, this phrase occurs. "With all that in every place call upon the name of Jesus Christ our Lord." Our translation of this sentence is incorrect. A learned trinitarian commentator translates the phrase—all that "are *called by the name of Christ;*" meaning *christians*. This is doubtless the correct rendering. In the book of Re-

* You will notice that the word *God* was put into our Bible by the *translators;* it is in *Italics*.

velation, frequent ascriptions are made to the "Lamb that was *slain*." But no one can mistake the "Lamb that was slain" for the undying "*God who sitteth on the throne*." No one will be so wicked as to say the infinite Jehovah was killed by his own creatures. No one in christian lands can be so senseless as to worship for *God* a being who was *crucified* and *slain* by wicked hands. But all christians can heartily unite in grateful and reverential ascriptions to *Jesus who* "*has redeemed us to God by his blood*." Not a passage, therefore, can I find, in which worship was offered to Jesus as God, after his ascension. His uniform example and precepts must therefore forever remain the unerring rule of christian worship. The *Father* will receive the homage of *true* worshippers. Acts. vii. 56, 59. 1 Cor. i. 1, 2. Rev. v. 9, 13.

What then must be our conclusion? The Old Testament does not contain one command to offer religious homage to Jesus; nor an example in which he was worshipped as God. On the contrary, we are instructed, by precept and example, to offer all prayers to the one true God, the Father of Jesus. The New Testament does not once direct us to offer religious homage to Jesus; and does not furnish one example in which he was worshipped as God; but contains explicit prohibitions of the act. On the contrary, it contains ninety passages in which we are directed to offer all prayers to God the Father. I must therefore conclude that Jesus is not to be worshipped as God. But when I consider how much he has done and suffered for the salvation of the world; when I remember his compassionate conduct, and lovely character, and heavenly spirit; when I feel my infinite

obligations to him for light, and truth, and hope, and heaven, I am ready to offer him the grateful devotions of my soul. But his words immediately rise in my mind. He that *keepeth my commandments*, he it is that *loveth* me. And then I *dare* not—I *dare* not disobey the uniform instruction of the whole Bible. When he commands, in so many words, "*ye shall ask me nothing*," I *dare* not say, I will ask him for any thing. For I fear the voice of conscience would loudly proclaim—"See thou do it not; *worship God*." And I would not knowingly deny the Lord Jesus.

My Friends,—my discussion is finished. I have noticed three examples of the denial of the Lord Jesus; and from them, I have attempted to prove three things; first, that Jesus is not God; second, that he is not equal with God; and third, that he is not to be worshipped as God. My conclusions appear to be fairly, and fully, and firmly established.

Now is there any possible way in which you can overthrow these conclusions? You will attempt the work in but one manner. You can say that Jesus is possessed of two distinct natures; that he is "very God" and "very man;" that all my arguments refer to his human nature; and in that sense are perfectly sound; but that he also possesses a nature truly divine; and is in truth directly the opposite of all that has been proved. This you can say, and may say, if you please. But this has not been said, either by Jesus himself, or by his apostles, or by any sacred writer. Not a word, not even a hint, can you find in the whole Bible, which intimates that Jesus possessed two distinct natures. Your saying, therefore, has no foundation in revelation; it is mere human assertion.

But how would you attempt to prove the truth of this assertion? You would first prove, as I have done, that Jesus is a created, dependent being. Then you would say, his names, and attributes, and offices, and works, and words prove him to be "very God." Now apply this mode of reasoning to the ancient Prophets, and the inspired Apostles. They also received exalted titles, and were placed in high offices, and wrought stupendous miracles, and uttered lofty language. Some of them were called Gods. Some of them controlled the rain and wind, the river and sea, the moon and sun, life and death. Some of them foretold future events, and imparted their prophetic spirit. Some of them are to judge the world and even angels. Some of them began their discourse with these magnificent phrases. "Hear O heavens, and give ear O earth." And none of them were more careful than Jesus, to attribute all their powers, and privileges and honors to God. Why then do you not affirm that these persons were very Gods, as well as very men? Why do you not invest them with two distinct natures? You have precisely the same *kind* of evidence, and not greatly inferior in degree, to prove them truly divine, as you have to prove Jesus truly divine. You must do it, to be consistent in your reasoning; or you must admit that he had but one nature. You have your choice.

But this is not all. Admit that Jesus is possessed of two natures; and what does the admission prove? It proves that Jesus was a deceiver! Yes. I repeat it. This admission proves that Jesus was a deceiver; as I will show to your satisfaction. His disciples asked him a fair question. They wished to know the precise time when Jerusalem should be destroyed. He gave them an apparently hon-

est answer. "Of that day, and that hour, knoweth no *man*, no, not the *angels* which are in heaven, neither the *son*, but the FATHER." You do not pretend that the son is the Father. Now the son either did know the day and hour when this event would take place, or he did not know. If he was very God, he did know; for God must know all things. And if he did know, he uttered a deliberate falsehood; and intentionally deceived his disciples; for he unequivocally and solemnly declared that this exact time was known to no being but the Father; was not known to the son; when it must have been, had he possessed a nature truly divine. And if he deceived them in this instance, where is your evidence that he did not deceive them in every instance? You have none. You can place no dependence on his declarations. Such is the *natural*, the *necessary*, the *inevitable* consequence of investing the son with two natures. For my own part, if I cannot believe every word Jesus uttered, he is no Saviour for me. Thank God, I can. I believe he had but one nature. And believing this, I receive his instructions as *true*—AS DIVINE. Yes. When he declared to his disciples—"ALL THINGS THAT I HAVE HEARD OF MY FATHER, I HAVE MADE KNOWN UNTO YOU"—I believe he uttered the *truth*, the WHOLE TRUTH, and NOTHING BUT THE TRUTH.

My Friends—The question is now put to your consciences. On this infinitely important subject, are you disposed to receive the plain, current, unembarrassed doctrine of revelation? Are you willing to believe that "there is but one God the Father;" that "the Father *sent* the son to be the Saviour of the world;" and that the "true worshippers shall worship the Father?" Will you make the holy scriptures the standard of your faith,

and the rule of your conduct? And will you study them in connexion, and compare passage with passage, and exercise your common sense in their interpretation, so as to obtain their true meaning? Or will you form a system of belief, from detached verses, and obscure expressions, and human inferences, and party explanations? You have your choice.

But remember, my friends, you are accountable for your opinions and conduct. And also remember, that you are to be judged by a plain rule now in your possession. Hear the solemn declaration of Jesus. "He that rejecteth me, and receiveth not my *words*, hath *one* that judgeth him; the *word* that I have spoken, the *same* shall judge him in the last day." Yes. You are to be judged by the very words Jesus has spoken, and which are recorded in the gospels. And when placed before his judgment seat, should you be charged with accusing him of making himself God, what would be your answer? Could you produce one passage in which he declared himself to be God? Did he not take all possible pains to represent himself as wholly dependent on God? Did he not say in so many words, that his Father was "the only true God?" And should you be charged with accusing him of making himself equal with God, what would be your answer? Could you produce one passage in which he declared himself to be equal with God? Could you not produce hundreds, in which he declared his inferiority to his Father? Did he not say in so many words—"My Father is greater than I?" And should you be charged with worshipping him as God, what would be your answer? Could you produce one passage in which he commanded any one to worship him as God? Did he not uniformly represent his Father as the only

proper object of religious worship? Did he not say in so many words—"Ye shall ask me nothing?" At that solemn tribunal, it will be of no avail to say, that you were thus taught by your parents, your instructers, your creeds, your ministers. To none of these, to no man, to no body of men, are you accountable for your religious sentiments. To God alone are you answerable. He has given a revelation for you to study, and understand. By this, will sentence be pronounced. If your guilt be *unintentional*, pardon will be granted; but if caused by *neglect* or *wilfulness*, deplorable must be your condition. Remember this. And also remember the words of Jesus. "Whosoever shall be ashamed of *my words*, of *him* also shall the son of man be ashamed, when he cometh in the glory of his Father." John viii. 50. Mark viii. 38.

A

LETTER

TO AN

ORTHODOX MINISTER,

ON

REVIVALS OF RELIGION.

BY BERNARD WHITMAN.

BOSTON:
PUBLISHED BY GRAY & BOWEN.
1831.

WAITT & DOW, PRINTERS, 122 WASHINGTON-STREET, BOSTON.

LETTER.

Reverend Sir:

I am credibly informed that you publicly made the following statements respecting revivals of religion. You asserted that such excitements were enjoyed by none but orthodox denominations; that they were produced by scriptural means and measures; that they yielded the genuine fruits of the gospel; that they were the special work of the holy spirit, and that all who opposed them were enemies to the cause of Christ. Now I firmly believe your declarations have no foundation in truth; and to state the honest reasons for this belief is the design of the present Letter. And I would not have you suppose that I have undertaken to address you on a subject with which I have no experimental acquaintance. I can assure you, that I once defended the divine origin and beneficial tendency of such revivals; that I denounced all who opposed them as boldly as you now do, and that nothing but a thorough knowledge of their injurious consequences, and a better acquaintance with the holy scriptures, convinced me of my dangerous error. I hope and pray, therefore, that my remarks and arguments may be instrumental in promoting the cause of pure and undefiled religion. I now proceed to the examination of your five propositions.

I. You assert that none but orthodox sects are favored with religious excitements. I think a plain statement of facts will prove your assertion untrue; and also convince you, that these revivals do not depend upon the peculiar religious opinions of any christian denomination. Let us then attend to the facts in question.

In the first place, what is the origin of modern revivals? They originated with John Wesley and George Whitefield, the founders of the Methodist denomination. These distinguished men began their ministry in England at a period of great moral apathy, and religious indifference, and even gross immorality. They adopted an earnest, direct, familiar, pungent and impassioned style of preaching. They usually addressed the less informed and more depraved classes of society. Their intelligible, powerful and heart-rending appeals produced a most astonishing and wonderful excitement of the passions and feelings. They were at first greatly pleased with the striking results of their labors, and readily ascribed them to the special operations of the holy spirit. But more experience convinced them of the deceptive character of such promising appearances, and led them to doubt the expediency of such commotions. For they early discovered that it was much easier for their converts to relate marvellous experiences, than to exhibit christian dispositions and characters.

I have said that modern revivals originated with the founders of Methodism. I cheerfully admit, that religious excitements existed before their day among the Anabaptists, Quakers, and various other sects. But you will not pronounce their disgusting extravagances to be genuine revivals of religion. I also admit that seasons of uncommon attention to religion had occasionally been experienced in the calvinistic churches both in Europe and America before this period. But you find no traces of anything like our present delusions in any of the reformed denominations. So that we may justly consider Wesley and Whitefield

the authors of modern revivals. Their followers in this country have generally aimed to imitate the example of their leaders. Most of the Methodist preachers in America have taken unwearied pains to produce similar excitements; and they have labored with very considerable success among the more ignorant and more excitable members of our community. Now you should remember, that there is a diversity of religious opinions among the professors of this pious sect. Nearly all in this country embrace arminian views of the gospel, and are the disciples of Wesley. The larger portion of those in England receive the five points of Calvinism, and are the followers of Whitefield. Not a few both in England and America have been led by a prayerful perusal of the scriptures to embrace Unitarianism. Read Ashworth's most interesting account of the rise and progress of the Unitarian doctrine among the Methodists of Rochdale, Newchurch, and other places. Notwithstanding this diversity of views, these revivals are principally confined to the arminian Methodists of America.

2. In the second place, what is the fact in relation to the Calvinistic denomination? When Whitefield first visited this part of our country, such revivals were scarcely known to the descendants of the pilgrims. Some of the orthodox clergy and laity cordially united in his new measures for their production; and they succeeded in raising such a tempest and whirlwind of passion, contention, reviling and wickedness as never before desolated the New England churches. Others of the orthodox clergy and laity, equally learned, zealous and pious, openly opposed the operation of this human machinery; and for their conscientious adherence to the rules of good order and gospel institutions, were denounced as the enemies of Christ and God. Even Whitefield declared that the president of Yale College had no more grace in his heart than the chair over which he leaned when offering his prayers

Since that memorable period, a portion of the Calvinists of our land have favored such excitements, and made them the special objects of their prayers and exertions. A minority have never been convinced of their divine origin and beneficial tendency; and have accordingly observed a respectful silence on the subject, or manfully opposed their prevalence. At this moment, you find several individuals of distinction raising their voices against the unscriptural measures adopted for their production. Among the Calvinists of Europe, such revivals have been comparatively unknown. Those in England are striving at this very time to bring them into existence. They have been excited to this undertaking by the flattering, partial, and, as I believe, *deceptive* accounts, of what was taking place in the American churches. They have been led to believe in their practicability, usefulness and divine origin; and have accordingly put in operation some of the machinery necessary for their production. As yet little or no success has attended their exertions. So that it is but a few years since such revivals were introduced into your denomination; and they have never been fostered but by a minority of the whole Calvinistic body. You will also remember that important divisions are now taking place among the adherents of orthodoxy throughout the world. The greater portion in Germany have embraced universal salvation. The most distinguished minister of the party in England, Dr J. P. Smith, has adopted views of the inspiration of scriptures nearly accordant with those embraced by Unitarians, and has even denied Solomon's Song to be any part of the book of revelation. In this country, warm disputes exist on several topics, such as the eternal generation of the Son, the atonement, the depravity of man, and regeneration; so that what is orthodoxy at Princeton is denounced as heresy at Andover. But nearly all the leaders in America are now uniting their forces to crush Unitarianism by the production of these religious excite-

ments. Even Dr Taylor, of New Haven, who considered himself so severely abused by Dr Woods, of Andover, has not hesitated to visit Boston, and to engage earnestly in this holy warfare.

3. In the third place, what is the fact in relation to the Episcopal denomination? Its members very generally disapprove of these excitements. When they have raged in their immediate neighborhoods, they have successfully labored in checking their progress and influence. One of the American bishops, not long since, denounced them as injurious to the cause of pure religion, and exhorted his clergy to oppose their prevalence. And at this very moment, the editors of their leading journals are raising their voice against such delusions. Take the following sentences from the Philadelphia and Hartford periodical publications. 'There are some kinds of religious excitement, created by mechanical operations, existing through animal effervescence, and leading to much irregularity, which we are happy to know are not very frequent in the Episcopal church, and are not encouraged by Episcopalians in general, because they are not persuaded of their being in any good degree conducive to true charity or real godliness. They cannot see in them those fruits of faith and piety, which ripen unto eternal life. The bonds of christian charity are all rent asunder, the meekness and humility of the gospel contemned, the regular ministers of Christ after a season shunned and despised, and self-conceit, spiritual pride, and self-righteousness permitted an unlimited and unyielding ascendency.' This will suffice for the present. A few, however, of both clergy and laity among the Episcopalians entertain different opinions on this subject, and have occasionally united with the revivalists of other sects in the production of these excitements. Now you are aware that there is a great diversity of religious opinions in this denomination. The larger portion of both clergy and laity give an Arminian interpretation to the thirty-nine articles. A re-

spectable minority, especially in England, give them a Calvinistic meaning. Many who still remain within the bosom of this church have fully embraced Unitarian sentiments. Some whole societies have adopted an expurgated liturgy. And you must also remember that our pilgrim fathers professed fully to believe in the thirty-nine articles, and found no fault with this formulary of faith. Listen to the following words of Dr Increase Mather. 'The churches here were planted a noble vine. Indeed, it *was not with respect to the fundamentals in doctrine*, that our fathers came into this wilderness. For they agreed to the doctrinal articles of the church of England as fully as any, and more fully than many of the conformists of that church.' But with all their present diversity of sentiment, the Episcopalians are almost uniformly opposed to modern revivals.

4. In the fourth place, what is the fact in relation to the Baptist denomination? In our own country, most of its members favor such religious excitements; but in England, even to the present time, such revivals have scarcely had an existence among the believers in immersion. In this sect there is likewise a great diversity of religious sentiment. Take all into the account who are called Baptists, and you will probably find a majority who still adhere to Calvinism. But the number who nave embraced Arminian views is exceedingly large and very respectable, especially in our Western States; and they usually meet with much greater success in producing these excitements than their Calvinistic brethren. Another very large body have renounced human creeds and the peculiarities of orthodoxy, but still hold to immersion and retain the name of Christian Baptists. Alexander Campbell, who had the controversy with Robert Owen in Cincinnati, is the head of this most respectable class. From him I learned the nature of their belief, which is decidedly anti-trinitarian and anti-calvinistic; and also the probable amount of their professors, which is very large. Most of this party pro-

duce these revivals; and even one of their preachers, baptized several hundred converts, the fruits of his own preaching, within one year. In England, the denomination is divided into particular, or close communion Baptists, and general, or open communicants. The latter division, has, to a very considerable extent, embraced Uintarianism. But neither section favor these religious excitements. So that, upon the whole, the liberal baptists far exceed their orthodox brethren in the frequency and extent of their revivals.

5. In the fifth place, what is the fact in relation to the Congregational Unitarian denomination? Some of its preachers have formerly believed such excitements beneficial under certain restrictions. They have accordingly adopted the necessary measures for their production. Their exertions have been crowned with ample success. Without advancing one word of Calvinism, they have succeeded in producing very extensive revivals. They have managed them with so much prudence and resolution as to avoid the most serious evils which are their common attendants; and in this way have received large accessions to their churches. I could refer you to names and dates in proof of this statement. It will however be sufficient to name the late Rev. Abiel Abbot, of Beverly, who had two such excitements during his ministry, and from whom I received a full account of all the measures adopted for their production and regulation. I ought also to add that his experience in these convinced him of their evil tendency. But far the largest portion of this denomination has ever opposed these extravagances on principle; and at this moment I know scarcely an individual who would stand forth in their defence. I will not however speak for others; but for my own part, I must affirm, that I consider all such commotions as the natural result of human machinery. I have conscientiously raised my voice against their prevalence. And when they have been raging in our immediate vicinity,

we have successfully endeavored to preserve our hearers from their baneful influence; and the consequence has usually been, that our numbers have increased rather than diminished.

6. In the sixth place, what is the fact in relation to the *Christian* denomination? Most of its members are favorable to such excitements. They have been greatly indebted to them for the rapid and extensive spread of their peculiar sentiments. Within thirty years, they have established more than one thousand flourishing churches in the United States. They have drawn largely from the Calvinists, the Methodists, the Baptists; and their increase has been essentially aided by their frequent and extensive revivals. In fact, no denomination has produced them so frequently as the Christians, according to their respective numbers. And what are their distinguishing articles of faith? They have authorized one of their elders to publish a history of their origin, progress, opinions and numbers; and from this official document, you learn that they receive the Bible alone as their standard of faith and practice, and pay no allegiance to human creeds or fallible masters; that they uniformly reject the doctrine of the trinity, and the five points of Calvinism, and that they have almost universally embraced Unitarian views of the scriptures. And while preaching these sentiments fully and distinctly, they are almost daily extending their borders, and planting new and respectable churches. I noticed not long since, that one of their preachers had converted and immersed from three to four hundred persons in one year, in the Western States. During my visit among them, I always found them distinguished for good morals and practical piety, although much persecuted and defamed by their orthodox brethren.

Now, sir, you will not I presume question the general correctness of this statement. And what do such facts prove? The five following propositions: 1. That your assertion is altogether untrue. 2. That these revivals

do not depend on the peculiar religious sentiments of any christian denomination. 3. That those ministers, who think such revivals favorable, either to the growth of religion, or the increase of their party, adopt the necessary measures for their production; and that sooner or later these exertions are crowned with a greater or less degree of success, be their creed heterodox or orthodox. 4. That those preachers who believe these excitements to be unscriptural and of injurious tendency, not only cease from using any means for their existence, but adopt the necessary measures for preventing their spread among their hearers; and that their labors are also equally successful, be their creed orthodox or heterodox. 5. That no sentiments are so well calculated for the promotion of these revivals as those embraced by Unitarians; for no sect meets with so much success in getting them up as the Unitarian Christians and Baptists. In short, it is perfectly evident that any minister who is so disposed, may produce one of your religious excitements. I hope, therefore, you will correct the wrong impressions which your assertions have left on the minds of less informed hearers.

II. You assert that orthodox revivals are produced by scriptural means and measures. I think a plain statement of facts will prove your assertion untrue; and also convince you that most of the methods adopted for their production are unchristian. Let us then attend to the facts in question.

1. What is the first step to be taken in getting up an orthodox revival? *Prayer meetings.* Your leaders become alarmed for the safety of their peculiar sentiments. They lament the rapid and extensive spread of liberal views. In order to preserve and perpetuate a belief in human formularies, they determine to promote a religious excitement. They enlist the feelings and services of the more zealous, excitable, and officious church members. They commence operations

by establishing frequent prayer meetings. You hold them at an early hour in the morning; you continue them to an unreasonable hour in the evening, and you appoint them for almost every day in the week. When assembled, you implore the special outpouring of the holy spirit; and you would have the ignorant believe, that a supernatural influence is actually exerted on the hearts of both saints and sinners, by which the former are revived and the latter converted. You have several prayers at each meeting, and several meetings each week, and the constant burden of your unceasing petition is uniformly the same; the special influences of the Almighty. You approach the throne of grace without respect or reverence, and talk to the eternal Jehovah as if he were your equal, and pledged to aid your party movements, and you narrate events of recent occurrence, and circumstances of present existence, as if he were ignorant of human transactions, and could receive directions from his sinful creatures. Your familiarity is disgusting to the most common and shocking to the most pious. You sometimes go so far as to call the names of individuals, families and denominations; and denounce those who dissent from your doctrinal belief as infidels, emissaries of satan, and enemies to all holiness. You even beseech the Lord to send trouble, anguish and affliction into their dwellings, and to shake them over the pit of hell. Your feelings become gradually excited through the influence of sympathy and combined exertion. You readily attribute this natural result of your belief and operations, to the supernatural influence of God Almighty. You profess to believe, and endeavor to make others believe, that this animal excitement is the special and immediate answer to your devotions.

Now can you call this first step for the promotion of a revival a scriptural measure? Will you pretend that such meetings, so often, for such objects, and so conducted, are authorized by the instructions or example

f any inspired teacher. Are they not virtually condemned by the preaching and practice of our Saviour? Look at the history of his life, and explain his sayings by the rules of consistent interpretation. Did he not severely censure the Pharisees for their long, and ostentatious prayers? Did he not solemnly admonish his disciples to avoid the vain repetition of the heathen? Did he not assure them that they were not heard for their much speaking; and that their wants were known to their Heavenly Father before their devotions ascended? Did he not furnish them with a form of prayer; short, comprehensive, charitable and dignified? Did he not declare that their Heavenly Father was more ready to give them his holy spirit, in his own manner, than earthly parents are to give good gifts to their children? Did he not compare the influence of the divine spirit to the blowing of the wind, and thus instruct them that the time and manner of its operation could not be discerned? In short, can you point to a passage in the whole Bible, in which Jesus ever authorized the appointment of frequent prayer meetings? ever directed christians to pray for the *special* outpourings of the holy spirit? ever allowed an almost endless succession of repetitions in devotional exercises? ever taught any one to address the Deity with shocking familiarity or irreverent indecency? ever permitted his followers to denounce their brethren and pronounce judgment on their hearts and characters? ever instructed us to expect immediate and supernatural answers to our prayers? or ever encouraged us to make a distinction between the operations of the spirit and the results of our own thoughts and feelings? In saying this, I do not mean to condemn meetings for social worship, when convened at proper seasons, and conducted in a proper manner. I do not intend to condemn petitions for the influences of the holy spirit, but merely to prove that we have no authority from scripture to ask or expect anything *special*, or as this word is understood, *miraculous*. With these qualifica-

tions, I think it must be evident to all, that your first measure is unscriptural.

2. What is the second step to be taken in getting up an orthodox revival. *Visiting from house to house.* The promoters of the excitement sometimes district a village or town, and assign to each individual his share of the barren vineyard. More commonly the minister takes this labor wholly on his own shoulders, in connexion with some clerical assistants. They enter a house, and assemble its inmates. They make known the object of their visit, and either ask liberty or take liberty, to make a prayer. They inform the Almighty, that more or less of the present company are still in the gall of bitterness and bonds of iniquity; and they ask for the supernatural influences of his spirit to convert them from nature to grace. They then utter many sentiments which are calculated to operate on the feelings of the hearers, and advance many opinions which would be considered uncivil in conversation. This misnamed prayer, you follow with a series of exhortations and denunciations. You frequently assume an authoritative and dictatorial style of address. You often manifest an uncharitable and self-righteous temper. You seem to regard all who will not pronounce your shibboleth, both old and young, as so many totally depraved wretches on the very brink of perdition. You threaten them over and over again with all the plagues of this world, and all the miseries of hell, unless they repent immediately. You sometimes take the young females by the hand, and allow them a certain number of minutes to determine whether they will be saved or damned. You are very careful to visit those families in which the male members are opposed to your operations, in the absence of husband, father, or brother; for you fear their presence and influence. In all this process, you design to frighten the weak, the timid, the young and the ignorant. In many families you meet with considerable success, and are instrumental in creating alarm, terror,

discord, reviling and hatred in once peaceful and united households. When your church members are sent around on this errand, it occasionally happens, that the ignorant, and perhaps suspected zealot, thus insults his more virtuous and pious neighbors. In this way the excitement is rendered more powerful and extensive.

Now can you call this second step for the promotion of a revival a scriptural measure? Will you pretend that this kind of visiting, and praying, and frightening was ever adopted by any inspired teacher? Is not the whole process virtually condemned by the example and instructions of our Saviour and his apostles? Did the heavenly Jesus ever district the city of Jerusalem, and send his apostles to visit every individual and family? Did he ever ask the members of a household for liberty to pray in their presence; or ever proceed to offer up devotions against their consent; or ever denounce them as unconverted in his addresses to his heavenly Father? Did he ever say to the fearful and distrusting, that endless torments must be their portion unless they repented within a given number of minutes? Did he ever conduct unkindly, or uncivilly, or impolitely towards an individual or family? Did he send his apostles abroad to create terror, dismay, and excitement? Did he not charge them to say—peace be within this dwelling, whenever they entered a house? On the other hand, did he not level most of his denunciations against the loud professing, over zealous, madly proselyting Pharisees? Did he not censure them for their disfigured faces, their ostentatious prayers and alms-givings, their neglect of the weighter matters of the law, and their spiritual pride and self righteousness. Did not the apostles severely reprove those who went creeping from house to house to lead captive silly women? Did they not command those to be marked and avoided who caused divisions in families, neighborhoods and societies? Did they not rank busy-bodies in other people's con-

cerns, among the most depraved and wicked? In these remarks, I would not be understood as disapproving pastoral visits; but you well know that pastoral visits and revival visits are as opposite as light and darkness. And I think every man must see that this latter practice is altogether unscriptural.

3. What is the third step to be taken in getting up an orthodox revival? *Multiplied meetings for exhortation.* You have lately held three or four long services on the sabbath, and three or four more on each of four days in the week. You entreat all your society to attend, and bring with them as many of their friends and acquaintances as can possibly be urged to accompany them. You suppose that those members of Unitarian parishes who have never witnessed your revival measures, may be more easily excited than those of your own hearers who have been accustomed to such influences? You invite from abroad those preachers who have acquired some celebrity in creating an excitement, and who are well calculated to arouse the feelings and passions, by their appearance, voice and gestures; by their bold declamation and reckless denunciation; by their exaggerated statements and frightful descriptions. Your discourses are characterized by extravagance. You represent the Supreme Being as an inexorable Judge, glowing with the flames of wrath and anger, determined to wreak his vengeance on all of his dependent creatures who will not bow to his sceptre. You paint the depravity of man in colors as dark as the blackness of hell; and to the infernal regions you must resort to find any living resemblance to your picture. You describe the torments of the damned, by images at once disgusting, shocking, and terrific; and pronounce them both unutterably excruciating in degree, and endless in duration. From almost every page of your harangue, the flashes of a material hell are constantly bursting, and the suffocating smoke of burning brimstone continually ascending. By way of

contrast, you depict the joys of the redeemed in the glowing language of poetic fiction. But this is not all. You introduce accounts of what had occurred in other societies and distant places; and relate doubtful stories of the most alarming character. You tell of one opposer of your excitements who has been deprived of his reason by the miraculous interposition of Deity on account of his opposition. You tell of a young female who lately died a most excruciating and wretched death, because she had forsaken inquiry meetings. You mention the remarkable conversions of persons of the least civil or military note, in order to prove that the revival may extend beyond weak women and still weaker men. You endeavor to impress the conviction that the Lord is present in a special manner, that he cannot be expected to remain long, and that many of your hearers will be dead before his return. And you conclude your exhortation by assuring all present, that some of their number will die before morning; that this is their last opportunity to get religion; and that unless they improve the passing moment, the morrow's light will find them weeping and wailing among the damned souls of the infernal world. You then have your anxious seats, or your trap doors to a room beneath, where the frightened are collected, and subjected to a new and equally unchristian process. Time would fail me to record all the fanatical extravagances of such meetings.

And can you call this third step for the promotion of a revival a scriptural measure? Will you pretend that the gospel furnishes any authority for such proceedings? Did our Saviour ever appoint three or four meetings on the sabbath, or a dozen or twenty during a week? Did he ever send for others to help him produce an excitement? Did his revival discourses bear the least resemblance to those of modern days? Read again his sermon on the mount, and every exhortation he deliv-

ered; and if you are not willing to confess that his preaching condemns yours, I shall begin to think you absolutely blinded. When Paul first preached the gospel at Antioch, why did he wait from one sabbath till the next, before he completed his message? Why did he not call the people together during the week, and hold four-day meetings? Had he no love for their souls? Or did he not understand how to get up a revival? And where in the whole compass of revelation, can you find any model for your representations of God and his government; of the nature and means of conversion; of the depravity and inability of mankind; of the regions of hell and heaven! Nay, where can you find any such specimens of religious extravagance and fanaticism, not to say falsehood and madness?

4. What is the fourth step to be taken in getting up an orthodox revival? *Whispering meetings.* Those disposed to favor the excitement assemble of an evening in a dimly lighted apartment. Much the larger portion of the company are females. Either the minister or some male assistant passes around the room, and whispers something into the ear of every individual. He generally repeats some striking passage of scripture, or gives some solemn admonition, or utters some awakening truth, or puts some startling question, or pronounces some unauthorized assertion. By the stillness and deathlike silence of the scene; by the ghastly appearance of every countenance on which the dying light casts its paleness; by a sudden change in the train of thought or state of feeling, he hopes to excite a high degree of terror and agitation. For when the timid subject is thoroughly frightened, she can be moulded at pleasure; she can be induced to make any acknowledgements, and sign any confessions and give her assent to any creed, and adopt any party measures. The whole process reminds one most forcibly of the modes of operation upon those suspected of witchcraft in the time of our fathers.

Now can you call this fourth step for the promotion of a revival, a scriptural measure? Is it authorized by either the precept or example of any inspired teacher? For a moment imagine the lowly Jesus at such a meeting. Behold him enter a dimly lighted hall, filled mostly with anxious and gloomy females. See him whisper something to each attentive listener as he passes around the chamber. Even the supposition of such a case is enough to shock every serious mind, destroy all worthy conceptions of our Saviour's dignity and delicacy, and stamp with reprobation every such proceeding. Can there be found a female of any refinement, of any sense of propriety, of any true modesty, of any christian humility, who would submit to such inquirers? Can there be found a husband who would willingly permit his beloved wife to pass through such an ungodly ordeal? Can there be found a father of any pretensions to civilization, who would knowingly expose a daughter to the operation of this device of bigotry and fanaticism? But I may not put you to the blush by asking further questions. The recollection of your Saviour's conduct must convince you of the unscriptural character of this measure.

5. What is the fifth step to be taken in getting up an orthodox revival? *Inquiry meetings.* When the unconverted have become so much terrified, as to confess themselves totally depraved, haters of their heavenly Father, and enemies to all goodness, they assemble on the appointed evening to inquire either of the minister or some church member what they must do to be saved. None are admitted but those who feel anxious for the salvation of their souls; for the conversation of others might savor too much of common sense. No discussion of disputed questions is allowed; for this practice might leave too much liberty to the understanding. The inquirers have but little to say, except to answer the questions of their leaders. And it frequently

happens that they are led to make very amusing and ludicrous replies. They are often assured that their convictions of sin are not sufficiently deep and pungent; that they must have some experimental acquaintance with the torments of the reprobate, and that they must even feel desirous of dethroning the Almighty. They are sometimes assured that they must feel willing to be damned, before they can be saved; that they can of themselves do nothing to effect their own conversion, and that even their prayers are an abomination to the Lord. They are likewise assured that they must cordially receive the doctrines of grace, or the human articles of orthodoxy; that this is a necessary evidence of the humility of their stubborn hearts, and that all inquiry and examination are out of the question when the spirit is in operation. In short, their reason and understanding are surrendered to the dictation of the minister and his assistants; and they readily embrace whatever opinions are prescribed for their special benefit, whether they relate to doctrines, practice, or other denominations.

Now can you call this fifth step for the promotion of a revival a scriptural measure? Is it authorized by either the teachings or doings of any inspired instructer? There was a most urgent necessity for persons to inquire of our Saviour the way of salvation. They had no written gospel. Not only so; when sinners came for information on this infinitely important question, what was his answer? Keep the commandments. There was no delay; nothing said about the nature and depth of their convictions; nothing about the doctrines of a trinity, an atonement, total depravity, and a calvinistic hell; nothing about human inability and special influences, and nothing about dreams, and visions, and experiences. No: the answer was plain and simple; so plain that the wayfaring man, though a fool, could not mistake. And what did the inspired apostles

say to those who inquired of them the way of salvation? The same thing in reality. Reform. Turn from your evil ways to the practice of holiness. Believe on the Lord Jesus. Prove the sincerity of your faith by obedience to his authority. Now the case is very different. We have the scriptures in our own language. We have the very answers of Jesus and his apostles. We can all read and understand for ourselves; for we have received the rudiments of our Christian education. There is no necessity for such proceedings. It is indeed quite another thing to inquire into the meaning of difficult passages of holy writ. This may be rendered a useful and necessary exercise; and it may also be proper, pleasant, and beneficial to meet for religious conversation. But to surrender ourselves into the hands of ministers or deacons on this momentous subject, is slighting the blessed gospel, is giving up our religious liberty, is putting our trust in fallible mortals, is degrading our very character, and is virtually forbidden by the whole history of our Saviour's life.

6. Such are some of the common measures for the production of orthodox revivals. Several others of a more dangerous character have been invented and put in operation in New York; but not generally approved in New England. I shall not describe the means used in colleges for the creation of such excitements. I have received a very full and satisfactory account of all the arts and contivances adopted in one such institution, from a gentleman who took a most active part in originating and promoting the commotion. Should the cause require it, this shall be made the basis of a separate publication. But one idea presses most forcibly on my mind, when I hear the boasting of your leaders concerning college revivals. Why have you not succeeded in getting up an excitement in Cambridge, if it is the special work of the Almighty? It is now several years since it was proposed among you to devote one hour,

each week, for this object. The proposal was extensively adopted. And is not the total failure of all your efforts; of all your stated devotions, expressly uttered for this purpose. And this is a conclusive proof that the excitements in other colleges are produced by the agency of human beings.

Now look at the common measures for getting up orthodox revivals. Are they scriptural? No. This you will not even pretend, after our present examination. Very well. Did not our heavenly Father understand the nature, depravity and danger of sinners when he caused the gospel to be published? Did he not know what measures were best adapted to bring them to repentance, conversion, regeneration, reformation? If you say he did not know, then you make him an ignorant and imperfect being; but if you say he did know these things, then you admit that your revivial measures have not his sanction. Not only so. Did not our Saviour know what was in man? Did he not love the souls of dying sinners as well, to say the least, as modern orthodox preachers? Did he not know, as well as they, to what present and future dangers the disobedient are continually exposed? Did he not know as well as they, what means were best calculated to promote the spread and influence of his own religion? If you say he did not know these things, you accuse him of ignorance and deception on the very business of his divine mission. If you say, that your revival machinery are improvements upon our Saviour's modes of operation, you charge him with want of qualifications for his office as Messiah and Saviour. If you admit that he did know all these things, then you must acknowledge that the measures of modern revivalists are unscriptural, and ought to be banished from the christian world. Take which horn of the dilemma you please.

III. You assert that orthodox revivals produce the

genuine fruits of the gospel. I think a plain statement of facts will prove your assertion untrue; and also convince you, that the principal effects of such excitements are unchristian.

1. In the first place, your revivals create disgust and infidelity. Look into your societies. No small number of your more respectable and intelligent members are completely disgusted with your proceedings. They regard your measures as sectarian and fanatical. They have lost all confidence in the good sense and sound judgment of your lay and clerical leaders. They do not hesitate openly and loudly to express their dissatisfaction. Were this all, I should not so much regret the effect; for I believe the present excitement may be instrumental of leading them to a study of the scriptures, and converting them to more liberal views of the gospel. But another class are driven by your extravagances into open infidelity. They cannot believe that a system of religion, which requires such worldly policy and artful manœuvering and gross improprieties, for its support and propagation, can proceed from the fountain of heavenly wisdom. They do not distinguish between the corruptions of the gospel, and the gospel itself; nor between the abuses of overheated and misguided zealots, and the undisputed blessings of christianity. They accordingly array themselves against religion itself, and regard most of its votaries as enthusiasts, fools or hypocrites. Yes; the notorious female apostle of infidelity has herself assured us, that she was induced to enter upon her present desolating mission, wholly from witnessing the blasting and ravaging evils of one of your revivals; and to this cause alone, is to be traced her zeal and perseverance in the service of irreligion and atheism.

And is all this christian fruit? Is this the natural consequence of a revival of pure religion in a christian land? By no means. Is there anything in the gospel itself to produce such pernicious results? No. The

rational, purifying, ennobling, exalting system of Jesus is directly calculated to secure the assent, the approbation, the hearty belief, the cordial co-operation of all candid and worthy citizens. Did the Author and Finisher of our faith, or his Apostles, ever adopt any measures for the propagation of christianity, which were calculated to produce such lamentable effects? No. They always appealed to the reason and conscience of their hearers, were always open and honest in all their movements, and uniformly manifested lovely dispositions and upright characters. O how did their modes of operation differ, while spreading the glad tidings of peace and salvation among the unbelieving, and inimical Jews and Gentiles, from those now adopted by your ministers, while endeavoring to convert to orthodoxy those whose belief in the gospel is unwavering, and whose morals are unimpeachable! And is not the influence of those, you are driving from Christ and from hope, wanted on the side of good order and uncorrupted religion? Yes; and for this disgust and infidelity, created by your unscriptural excitements, you are accountable. For this unnecessary offence to the cause of truth, you incur a fearful weight of responsibleness. As a dying man, as a friend to the best interests of society, I beseech you to abstain from thus wounding our common master in the house of his followers.

2. In the second place, your revivals create divisions and dissensions. They enter united families, neighborhoods, and societies. Yes; your excitements enter families. Husbands and wives are driven to different places of worship. The bonds of early and long cherished friendship are burst asunder. All community of feeling and interest and sympathy is destroyed. Those hearts which should have been filled with tender and indissoluble affection are swelled with a fearful pity for each others frailty. The children take sides with one or the other of the parents. Their young bosoms are

excited with bitterness towards each other. The words of reproof and condemnation fall from their agitated and quivering lips. Domestic harmony is disturbed; and home is no longer the abode of parental tenderness, filial piety, rational enjoyment, and mutual improvement. Your excitements also enter neighborhoods. Long tried friends are separated. Social intercourse is interrupted. Acquaintances meet without the accustomed salutation, or pass each other either with averted looks, or a self-righteous or sneering demeanor. The surrounding atmosphere is surcharged with tattlings, backbitings, envyings, and all manner of evil speaking. Your revivals likewise enter churches and societies. Those who had often walked to the house of God together, and communed at the same table, are widely estranged from each other; and they are led to believe, that they can no longer worship and commune in the same place, although all adhere to the same orthodox doctrines. Several such cases are within your own knowledge. Even those professing godliness are excited to denounce each other as unconverted, dishonest and wicked, notwithstanding their agreement on doctrinal sentiments. And not unfrequently new societies of different religious opinions are compelled by the denunciations of your leaders to organize themselves for the support of separate worship and instruction.

And is all this christian fruit? Is this the natural consequence of a revival of pure religion in a christian community? By no means. When the gospel was first promulgated, it did indeed set the father against the son, and the son against the father; the mother against the daughter, and the daughter against the mother; the mother-in-law against the daughter-in-law, and the daughter-in-law against her mother-in-law. For, on the one side, were the unbelieving, self-righteous, persecuting Jews, or the bigoted, superstitious, uncharitable heathen; and on the other side, were the converts to

the new religion, meek, peaceable, forbearing, forgiving and unresisting. Now the case is entirely different. Your revivals produce opposition and enmities among believers themselves. On the one hand, are the newly revived, or newly converted, too often manifesting the spirit, and imitating the conduct of the ancient unbelievers; and on the other hand, are those whom you denounce as totally depraved, wholly averse to all good, wholly inclined to all evil, very frequently exhibiting the disposition and character of the early christians. No doubt there are faults on all sides; but wo to those by whom the offence cometh. Paul condemns his Corinthian converts as *carnal*, because they had divisions among themselves, which were not the natural fruit of his religion. And I have no hesitation in applying the same epithet to those, who are now spreading the same blighting and soul-withering evils, by their injurious and unscriptural measures and exertions to swell the number of their adherents. As a friend to domestic comfort, to refined and elevated society, to christian order and institutions, I do beseech you to abstain from sowing the fruitful seeds of disorganization and wretchedness.

3. In the third place, your revivals create a neglect of important duties. Should one occur in the spring, the appropriate labors of the season are either omitted or imperfectly executed. Produce one in autumn, harvest is either injured or ruined for want of care and attention. At whatever period you get them up, whether in the city or country, many necessary domestic duties are either greatly slighted or wholly neglected. The wants and instruction of children are disregarded; and their lives are sometimes exposed by being left destitute of proper protection. A thousand little nameless services, which are absolutely essential to the well being, harmony, comfort and improvement of the family circle are entirely overlooked. O how many complaints of this nature have come to my knowledge!

And what are your leaders now doing? You are holding four day meetings, both in Boston and throughout the country; and you are extending them from one week to another, until you have nearly completed a whole month. Now can you suppose that those who attend from early morn to late at night, neglect no important duties? Were those hours formerly given to idleness, amusement, or unnecessary labors, which are now devoted to religious dissipation? Does their wealth justify them in leaving the daily cares of life to the management of hirelings? Go into their houses, stores, shops, and fields, and you will witness a sinful neglect of commanded duties.

And is all this christian fruit? Is this the natural consequence of a revival of pure religion in a christian commonwealth? By no means. If you neglect any incumbent duties for these services of human invention, are you not guilty in the sight of your heavenly Father? Has he not expressly commanded you to labor six days and do all your work. Are you not divinely instructed that He prefers mercy to sacrifice; a merciful act done towards man, in preference to worship offered to himself? And are there none among you who are in want of your charitable assistance; in want of food, and clothing, and employment, and books, and schools, and moral and religious instruction? Has not an apostle informed you, that those who neglect to provide for their own households, have denied the christian faith, and are worse than infidels? And are none of you neglecting to provide those things which are necessary for the peace, comfort, convenience, harmony and improvement of your connexions while attending public meetings, morning, noon and night; Tuesday and Wednesday, Thursday and Friday; the second, third, and even fourth week of the month? Has not Jesus plainly shown you, that his religion consists in faithfully performing all incumbent duties in their proper manner, proper time, and proper place?

Did he ever leave the service of mankind to preach, or sing, or pray, or exhort. Look well to his example. Has he anywhere given you leave to omit a single necessary duty for the services of man's invention? Will the performance of an uncommanded act, though good in itself, ever atone for the neglect of commanded and important duties? I put the question to your conscience, in the name of order and prosperity. I do beseech you to abstain from holding out encouragement to idleness, negligence and dissipation.

4. In the fourth place, your revivals increase the depravity of many who are exposed to their influence. One class become greatly alarmed, experience most pungent convictions, make no small noise about their hell-deserving souls, shake off their unnatural gloom and depression, are brought out most triumphantly, exhort others to embrace religion, condemn older and better christians than themselves, and set up for remarkable instances of converting grace. But within a short period, their unnatural excitement and elevation pass away, leaving them with the same nature, the same dispositions, the same propensities, the same characters as they possessed before their supposed regeneration. They immediately conclude that there is no reality whatever in religion itself; that those who keep up the appearances of piety, are mere hypocrites, and that the whole affair is an artful contrivance of priestcraft. They seem impelled by their past experience to banish all thoughts of God and duty from their minds, to give loose reins to their appetites and passions, and to plunge into the very depths of dissipation and infidelity. O how many could I name within the circle of my acquaintance who have been thus ruined as to all temporal and spiritual prospects. Another class pass through the same process in a similar manner, submit to an examination of the church committee, give a satisfactory relation of their experiences, are saved up till a sufficient number is secured to make a display at the sea-

son of admission to the company of saints, and for a season manifest great zeal and engagedness in the cause of orthodoxy. After a little time, however, they relax in their duties, and become suspected of being spurious converts. Some of them are disciplined for the grossest immoralities. I need not leave this village for examples of those, whose conversions have been loudly trumpeted, and who have exhibited great earnestness in denouncing unitarians, but who have since been censured and punished for such crimes as stealing and drunkenness. Others may be found in many of your communions who do no credit to their profession, and who manifest more of the temper of the world, than of the spirit of Christ. This you well know; and you will not think me uncharitable in mentioning the fact, since these very converts are so ready to condemn their more liberal as well as more christian brethren.

And is all this christian fruit? Is this the natural consequence of a revival of pure religion in this moral community? By no means. Does not this statement forcibly remind you of certain denunciations of our Saviour? Did he not severely censure the loud professing pharisees for their extravagant exertions to secure adherents to their party? Did he not affirm that they compassed sea and land to make one proselyte, and that when their object was accomplished, he was ten fold more the child of hell than before his conversion? Ought not the striking similarity of the two cases to lead you to consideration. And I beseech you, as you value the most cherished wishes of the parental bosom, as you value the purity and prosperity of the christian church, as you value the permanency of our free institutions, as you value the precept and example and sufferings of an ascended Saviour; as you value the salvation of immortal souls, I entreat you to abstain from those measures which may lead to the corruption of our youth, and the ruin of our holy religion.

5. In the fifth place, your revivals diminish the good-

ness and increase the wickedness of many converts. I now allude to some of those whom you regard as worthy members of your communion, and whom you consider among the genuine fruits of your excitements. I grant that they perform some duties which were before neglected; such perhaps as private and social devotion, examination of the scriptures, and attendance upon gospel ordinances. But I know they omit some duties which were before practised, and commit some sins which were before avoided. Yes; they are less loving, confiding and attentive as wives or husbands; less affectionate and obedient as sons or daughters; less kind and obliging as brothers or sisters; less generous and benevolent as friends or neighbors; less amiable, cheerful and instructive as companions or acquaintances; less devoted to intellectual and mutual improvement as citizens and countrymen. On the other hand, they are more unhappy in their tempers; more fretful in their dispositions; more gloomy in their spirits; more uncharitable towards those who dissent from their creed; more censorious of other christians; more vain and self-righteous; more proud and revengeful. I am sorry to name these things; but I know them to be truths. How many could I mention, how very many, whose characters have been thus affected by their conversion to orthodoxy, and their subjection to orthodox influences and management. You also know that my statements are literally true; and you will probably defend the conduct of these individuals. You will say that these dispositions and practices are the natural result of their principles, the inevitable consequences of their sentiments; and that they could not have their liberty, and do otherwise.

And is all this christian fruit? Is this the natural consequence of a pure revival of religion in a christian church? By no means. If these converts have been half as depraved as they pretend, they should humble themselves in dust and ashes, and not suffer themselves

to be puffed up with spiritual pride. If they have been wholly converted by the special influences of the spirit, as they affirm, they should never blame others for continuing in a state of nature; for in this case the reproach attaches to the Deity instead of the sinner. If they have now for the first time become enlightened, so as to comprehend the truths of the gospel, as they declare, they should be zealously engaged in searching the scriptures, and not in condemning as heretics and infidels those christians who have much more religious knowledge than themselves. If they would induce others to embrace religion, they should exhibit its good influences on themselves, by manifesting more purity of mind and heart, more amiableness and gentleness of temper, more kindness and benevolence of disposition, more cheerfulness and resignation of soul, more virtue and holiness of conduct, and more of christian goodness of character. For every diminution in anything true, honest, just, pure, lovely, or of good report, will assuredly be noticed and condemned; and every increase in anything sour, morose, unkind, peevish, bigotted, uncharitable and persecuting will also be considered irreligious and unchristian. As a member of the church of Christ, I do therefore beseech you to abstain from filling up our communions with those who disgrace their profession, and surrounding the Lord's table with unlovely and unworthy guests.

6. In the sixth place, your revivals discourage all free inquiry in matters of religion. Review the whole process. The fears, feelings, passions, imagination become highly excited. Reason, judgment, understanding are put to sleep. All patient investigation, rigid scrutiny, and calm deliberation are out of the question. When nature throws off the unnatural depression of spirits, and permits the joyful sensations of humanity to arise, this natural change is pronounced the supernatural work of the holy spirit; and the deluded victims are directed to date their conversion from this moment. They then embrace the religious

opinions of their preachers, without inquiry, examination or evidence; and pretend to understand those abstruse questions which have always puzzled the wisest heads in christendom. Even uneducated females have no hesitation in condemning the ablest divines of the period, as heretics, unbelievers, and unconverted. If the excitement is among the Methodists, the converts heartily believe the doctrines of Wesley; if among the orthodox, the five points of Calvin are embraced; and if among the Unitarian Christians, liberal views of the gospel are foundly cherished; and all the parties are equally positive that their opinions are literally true, and have been impressed upon their souls by the special influence of the holy spirit. Does the spirit teach Calvinism to one, Arminianism to a second, Unitarianism to a third, at one and the same time? But this is not all. You immediately receive those who have obtained a hope into your communions. You require their hearty assent to all the articles of a long human confession. You bind them down to this fallible standard with solemn oaths and obligations; and if they renounce the creed, you subject them to discipline and excommunication.

And is all this christian fruit? Is this the natural consequence of a revival of pure religion in our land of liberty and knowledge? By no means. Did not our Saviour command his hearers to judge for themselves concerning what was right? Did not his apostles speak to wise men, and direct them to examine their instructions? Did they not commend the Bereans for searching the scriptures daily, and for not being willing to take the opinions even of inspired teachers upon trust. And can a person find any time in a season of excitement for a calm and prayerful study of the sacred records? And if he could, is he in a proper state to investigate the subjects of religion, while under the control of fear, and despondency, and despair? And what motive is held out to induce him to investigate the nature of truth? He knows he

cannot be admitted to the church unless he will unhesitatingly receive the sentiments of his minister. He knows that he must be denounced as unconverted, unless he will assent to all the terms of the human formulary. He knows that he must be banished from christian fellowship, if he should be led by evidence to depart from the fallible standard of religious doctrine. Do you not throw every possible obstacle in the way of free inquiry and religious liberty? I do beseech you to remove all your unscriptural impediments in the way of divine truth. Require your hearers to believe and obey the scriptures. Let them spend at least one year in the study of the Bible before you compel them to swear fidelity to the dogmas of orthodoxy. Look at the instructions and example of our Saviour and his apostles; and see if you can find any authority for such proceedings.

7. In the seventh place, your revivals frequently produce mental derangement. This lamentable evil occurs in two different ways. One is this. Persons of delicate constitutions are exposed to the evening air, bad walking and weather, ill ventilated apartments; and bodily indisposition is the natural consequence. This co-operates with anxious minds, and shattered nerves, and depressed spirits, and thus dethrones reason. I recollect a case of this description which occurred in this place a few years since. The person was a young and modest female from a neighboring state. She became alarmed for her soul's welfare, and exposed her health while attending evening meetings. Insanity followed. I cannot recall the unpleasant circumstances without extreme pain; for she was the stay and staff of aged, and infirm, and indigent, parents; and it was truly melancholly to see one so young and fair and promising, exhibiting the most malicious behavior, and repeating the most horrid oaths, and blasphemies.—The other method in which your revivals produce derangement is this. Your horrid

views of the character of God and the nature of man; your irrational notions of divine agency and human inability; your frightful descriptions of an eternal material hell, sink into the minds of persons whose conscience is tender, whose heart is sincere, and whose temperament is melancholic. They dwell upon your dark, and dismal representations, until they feel themselves to be outcasts from hope, and heaven, and God. Fear and despair deprive them of their senses. It is not long since a young female in this place imagined herself to be one of the non-elect, although she had obtained sufficient hope at a former period to be admitted to the orthodox church. On one dark, stormy, dismal night, she left her boarding house, and terminated her wretched existence by drowning. Her body was discovered in a few weeks, but in too shocking a state to be seen by her agonized relatives. Had these been the only victims which I have known, my allusion to their unhappy fate would never have been penned. But, Sir, it is a most solemn and melancholy fact, that such cases are of frequent recurrence. O how many could I name who have thus been rendered torments to themselves, and curses to their relatives!

And is all this christian fruit? Is this the natural consequence of a revival of pure religion in a land of Bibles? By no means. Examine the scriptures. Did any such deplorable effects attend the instructions of Moses, or the denunciations of the Prophets? Did any such lamentable results follow the ministry of our Saviour or his apostles? No. And how do you reconcile this fact with the greatest evil of your excitements? Is not human nature the same now as in former years? Are mankind any more depraved now than in past ages? Did not the inspired preachers declare the whole council of God? Were they not as anxious for the conversion of sinners; did they not love the souls of their hearers as well; did they not know what measures to adopt

for the spread of truth, as well as orthodox ministers of the present period. Are you more faithful in applying the great principles of religion, and more skilful in managing the ignorant classes of society; or did the inspired instructers deliver different doctrines, and adopt different modes of operation? Not only so. What was the conduct of our Saviour towards those who were bowed down with a sense of their wickedness? 'Son, daughter, be of good cheer; thy sins are forgiven thee.' Does this mode of address bear the remotest resemblance to your treatment of the penitent? O that our people would look to the example and precepts of Jesus! As a follower of this master, I do beseech you to reflect on this subject, and to cease those modes of operation which are filling our hospitals with lunatics, and the breasts of relatives with unmingled grief or bitterness.

8. In the eighth place, your revivals are generally followed by an increased degree of indifference, irreligion and immorality. This is stated by your own denomination. And it is a most natural consequence of your unnatural commotion, following the law of all extremes which are ever tending to their opposites. The more respectable members of the congregation give practical evidence of their faith in orthodox doctrines. They believe that nothing can be done for their conversion, without the special influences of the holy spirit; and accordingly make themselves comparatively easy in delaying all attention to the subject until another revival. So that month after month, and even year after year, few or no additions are made to the communion. The more thoughtless and unprincipled indulge to greater excess. So that the house of God is deserted; the sabbath is spent in idleness, improper reading, unnecessary visiting or criminal dissipation; profaneness, falsehood, ignorance and open wickedness greatly abound. Some who have been sub-

jects of the excitement, seem to be rendered tenfold more depraved by the scenes through which they have passed; and take the lead in the march of immorality and infidelity. All this and much more may be proved true from the declarations of your own ministers.

And is all this christian fruit? Is this the natural consequence of a revival of pure religion in our land of christian institutions. By no means. Are we not at all times equally dependent on our heavenly Father? And can we be released, even for a moment, from our obligations to gratitude, obedience, submission, resignation, confidence and devotion? Are we not wholly indebted to Jesus for those personal, domestic, social, civil, literary and religious blessings, which raise us so highly above every ancient or modern unchristian nation? And can we be excused from our obligations to receive him as our Master, imitate him as our Exemplar, obey him as our Judge or Ruler? Are not all men our neighbors? And can we innocently neglect to do unto them in our thoughts, feelings, conversation and conduct, as we would have them do unto us? Are not our characters either improving or retrograding? And are we at liberty to relinquish our unceasing self-discipline, self-examination and self-cultivation? Are we not bound ever to think right, to feel right, speak right, and act right? Have we any license to indulge in wrong thoughts, failings, affections, dispositions, conversation or behaviour? Is any permission granted us for dulness and deadness in religion? Will it be a sufficient excuse for these evils, to say that the influences of the holy spirit were withdrawn; that we could not do otherwise under the frown of the Almighty? I do beseech you to put no such sophistical and dangerous arguments into the hands of the abandoned. Do not thus aid the cause of irreligion and immorality.

9. In the ninth place, your revivals encourage false views of religion. I have now to notice but a few particulars. First, you give false notions of the nature of relig-

ion itself, by constantly talking about *getting religion*. The ignorant suppose, that this thing to be gotten, is something extrinsic, and can be purchased by a constant round of religious services. Now Jesus took special pains to guard against this error. Whether we eat or drink, or whatsoever we do, we must do all to the glory of God. We must fulfil all our obligations. We must do right at all times, and in all things, and under all circumstances. And we are more religious when performing known duties than when neglecting them for any services of human invention. Second, you inculcate false views of conversion. You make the unlearned expect that the spirit will accomplish the whole work in one moment; and that after feeling its operation on their soul, they can never fall from duty. Thousands and tens of thousands have been ruined by this false and unscriptural notion. We are commanded to be renewed in the temper of our minds day by day; and to be constantly turning from every thing wrong to the practice of every thing right. Third, you encourage erroneous views of the divine agency. You speak of Deity as coming among you. You ask him to pour out his spirit in a special manner. You talk of his leaving the place. All such heathenish notions sink into uneducated minds; and they really regard the Deity but little better than a fickle monarch. One who had been converted in your way, lately called upon his former pastor for a dismission and recommendation. He said it was perfectly plain that Jesus was the Almighty God, for he even raised Lazarus from the dead. He was reminded of the prayer which Jesus uttered on that memorable occasion for divine assistance. His answer was, I presume God is a praying Being!!

Finally, you indirectly countenance unchristian behavior; for your converts are encouraged to denounce Unitarianism with boldness. Much of their zeal is manifested in this warfare. Instead of self-examination, serious meditation, reformation of all improper dispositions,

diligent study of the scriptures, much time is given to relating experiences, censuring other christians older, and more enlightened, and more holy than themselves. In short, the characters formed under revival influences are poor specimens generally of the influence of the genuine gospel. They do not resemble those individuals, in whose minds the seeds of heavenly wisdom were early sown, and who have cultivated those graces and virtues which adorn humanity, and which shone so conspicuously in the uniform deportment of our Saviour.

10. Such, Sir, are some of the common fruits of orthodox revivals. Many more, equally unchristian, might be mentioned, did my limits permit. I cannot help alluding to one or two more instances of a more aggravated nature. Look at the barbarous outrage lately committed by an orthodox family in Boston, on the person of a female relative from the country, in order to convert her from Unitarianism. You will find the disgraceful particulars in the Christian Register for the thirtieth of April. Look also at the evil effects of your excitements on female character. It is nothing uncommon to see those who were considered persons of modesty and delicacy, engaged in this holy warfare against Unitarians, denouncing them in the most shameful language, and persecuting them in the most cruel manner. It is matter of almost daily occurrence in this place, for girls to be told that they must go to hell if they attend a Unitarian meeting; and this too by those who profess to be followers of the meek and humble Jesus. Besides these things, there are usually proceedings in almost every revival, too indelicate, too indecent to be mentioned.

You will now aver, that I have not mentioned the good results of your religious excitements. I cheerfully grant what you require. I admit that some lukewarm professors are aroused to greater fidelity; that some good christians are induced to come forward to the ordinances; that many careless and thoughtless sinners

are awakened to seriousness, and that a few persons of immoral characters are reformed. This is all that you can justly claim. But it is fair to notice the limitation even of this statement. For you will allow that some who join the church at such seasons are really no better than before their admission; and that some who become professors are actually injured by their experiences. For all instances of genuine conversion and reformation, I gladly give thanks.

But this is not the whole of the story. I contend that all this good could have been effected without the attendant evils. The same persons could have been made christians in a more scriptural manner. Look to the churches of our fathers; were they not better filled than yours; were not their professors more godly; and were they not rendered so without the influence of a revival? Look to Scotland. Is not the number of communicants greater there than in your societies; and do they not give equal or better evidence of conversion; and not one soul of them was born again in the time of a revival. Could you not, then, by the proper and faithful use of scripture means, have made as many and as good christians, without producing such an abundant share of evil. I ask the public to decide if the disadvantages of your excitements do not far outweigh their advantages? I call upon you to examine this question; for I fear you are rushing headlong to temporal destruction. I fear you are giving a most dangerous wound to the cause of our common christianity. Before it be too late, O return to the Bible. Make that the standard of your faith and practice. Adopt the means there prescribed for the conversion of sinners; and make some amends for the aggravated evils you have inflicted.

IV. You assert that orthodox revivals are the special work of the holy spirit. I think a plain statement of facts will prove your assertion untrue; and also convince you, that these excitements are the natural fruit of human exertions.

1. In the first place, you know these revivals are never produced by the divinely appointed means of grace. They never follow the regular exercises of the sabbath; the solemn observance of gospel ordinances; the usual visits of the pastor; the devout study of the scriptures; the acts of secret and social devotion, and serious meditation and self examination. No. All your apparatus must be of an unusual character, and of human origin and contrivance. Meetings of various kinds must be multiplied. An unnatural style of preaching, praying and conversation must be adopted. New arts and modes of operation must be employed. Now you well know that God has nowhere promised to bless these measures; and you also well know, that he has promised to bless the means of his own appointment. Can you then believe, that he never blesses, with the special outpouring of his holy spirit, the means of his own appointment; and that he always blesses, with the special outpouring of his holy spirit, the means of human invention and addition? No. Then you must admit that these revivals are not the special work of the holy spirit; but the natural product of human machinery.

2. In the second place, you know these revivals are produced by the measures of different and even opposing denominations. They originated with the founders of Methodism. They are now got up by Calvinists, Arminians and Unitarians. The Unitarian Christians succeed in producing them the oftenest, and the most extensively; the liberal Baptists and the Arminian Methodists rank next in point of frequency and extent, and the Calvinists fall far behind both the other sects in these respects. You also know that the peculiar religious opinions of each denomination are directly opposed to the peculiarities of both the others. Calvinism is decidedly opposed to Unitarianism and Arminianism; and Unitarianism is opposed to Arminianism and Calvinism. Now if the excitement in one

party is the special work of the holy spirit, it must be in all; for the same features and characteristics are exhibited in all. Can you then believe that a God of truth sanctions error as much, and in the same manner, as he sanctions truth; which must be the case if these revivals are his special work; for Unitarianism and Calvinism cannot both be truth? Can you believe that he blesses Unitarianism with a greater outpouring of his holy spirit, than he does Calvinism; which must be the case if these excitements are his special work; for they are produced oftenest and most extensively under Unitarian preaching? If you cannot, then you must acknowledge that these revivals are not the special work of the holy spirit, but the natural fruit of human agency.

3. In the third place, you know these revivals are confined to those who believe in their divine origin. You sometimes find a society of Episcopalians and a society of Calvinists in the same village. Members of the same family belong to each; and near neighbors attend the different churches. The doctrinal opinions of both parties may be expressed in the thirty nine articles. The Calvinists believe in the divine origin of these excitements; they adopt the necessary measures for their production; nearly all their members become more or less excited. In the mean time, the Episcopalians regard their exertions as unscriptural and fanatical; they regard the revival as of human origin and pernicious tendency; while their friends and neighbors are deeply interested in the work, they remain calm and unaffected, and scarcely an individual has his feelings and passions aroused. Such instances are of frequent occurrence. Take Lowell for an example. You recollect the account which Mr Beckwith, the Calvinistic minister, gave of the powerful revival in that place, and for which document he obtained a ten dollar premium. You remember that he regarded the Episcopalians as enemies to the good work, and

that a member of that society exposed several errors in this premium statement. Now why is the excitement confined to those who believe in its divine origin? Why does it not extend to those who consider it the work of human beings and openly oppose its progress, and thus convince them of their dangerous mistake and aggravated wickedness? Can the mere belief on this point prevent the outpouring of the spirit? You must either admit that it can, which amounts to a perfect absurdity; or you must allow that these revivals are not the special work of the holy spirit, but the mere results of human opinion and action.

4. In the fourth place, you know these revivals are deliberately voted into being by orthodox ministers. I will illustrate this remark by a reference to the actual proceedings of your denomination. Your leaders saw and loudly lamented the rapid and extensive spread of Unitarianism. They concluded that its progress could be checked in no way so effectually as by a general religious excitement. One or two associations resolved to use the necessary means for its production. A large body of your clergy met in Boston at Election, and determined to do all in their power to secure the influence of the women, to cease controversy with Unitarians, and to make every possible exertion for the existence of a powerful revival. The same thing has been virtually done in several other meetings of the leaders in other States. Letters have been passed in relation to this desirable object. The conclusion of the whole matter seemed to be, that the work should be commenced in the cities, and then extended into the country. The revival preachers were accordingly stationed at their respective posts. It became convenient to have the notorious Beman in Charleston, S. C. When the train was well laid, the match was applied. The prayer bell rung at dawn of morning, from Maine to Georgia. All the revival machinery before used, and even some new inventions, were put into full operation.

And in many places some success has attended this mighty and combined effort. All this, and very much more of the same character, you know is literal truth. Now look at some of the votes of your ministers which have been brought to light. They resolved that it was their duty to have a revival of religion in their respective parishes, and that they would use *greater* means for its production. Now, if it was *their duty* to have a revival, was not the work their own? Can you believe that human beings are any where commanded to pour out the holy spirit? No. Then you must admit, that these revivals are not the special work of the spirit, but the natural result of increased human labor and management.

5. In the fifth place, you know these revivals are got up according to certain prescribed rules. Dr Beecher preached a discourse on this subject in Beverly some time since, an abstract of which I have received. He stated explicitly that these excitements could be produced at any time, and even kept in continual operation. He compared the influence of the spirit, to the law of gravitation; and affirmed that nothing was wanting but human co-operation to secure constant conversions. He then described very minutely the various measures to be adopted, and the different parts each class were to act in the drama. Not only so; others have published books for this purpose, and instructed the leaders what must be said and done, to secure success. Now if these prescribed regulations will produce the desired revival, is it not the product of human machinery? Has God any where or in any manner authorized such publications, or promised to bestow his blessing on such human measures? Look at the political leaders in our country. Are they not laying plans and adopting means to secure the election of a certain President? Should their efforts be crowned with success, would they be justified in calling the result of their operations, the special work of the holy spirit?

Do not all parts of the apparatus for the production of a religious excitement depend equally on human agency and management? Can you then believe that the former is the work of man, and the latter the work of God? No. Then you must admit that these revivals are not the special work of the holy spirit, but the natural product of well contrived human machinery.

6. In the sixth place, you know these revivals are produced or checked by the efforts of the human will. Let me illustrate this remark by three well known facts. The first is this. When you have organized a feeble church in a Unitarian parish, you immediately commence operations for the production of a religious excitement. You seem to think that some thoughtless individuals may be drawn in by your new and extraordinary measures. The pastor of the society devotes his principal attention to the accomplishment of this object. The one you have stationed in Billerica lately informed his church that he must leave them unless they could get up a revival. He called upon all to rise who would aid him in this desirable work; and then instructed them when, and how often, and how long to pray. Can you believe the Deity may be thus induced to aid in accomplishing a party and sectarian effort? Does he take sides with the Unitarian Christians when they meet with so much success in drawing from Calvinistic societies?

The second fact is this. When youare getting up an excitement in any place, you warn your hearers to avoid society; all places of innocent amusement; all meetings for literary instruction and improvement. In Northampton, an objection was made to the public celebration of Independence, for fear it might terminate the delusion. And even in Boston very lately, one of your preachers exhorted his hearers to retire home in silence, to avoid all conversation with each other, and to fasten their attention upon the solemn truths delivered. Can you believe the operation of the holy spirit is prevented by such slight

and innocent causes? And finally, these revivals may be checked and suspended by an appeal to reason and common sense. I have known two instances in which they were terminated very suddenly by such an appeal. The Unitarian minister in each case plainly stated views similar to those I have here advanced, and the delusion was dissipated. Now can you believe that the Deity is thus at the disposal of his sinful children? Can you believe that his special presence can be secured at any time in aid of a party undertaking, or driven away at any time by a free expression of honest opinion? If you cannot, then you will acknowledge that these revivals are not the special work of the holy spirit, but the fruit of party and sectarian measures.

7. In the seventh place, you know there is a great difference of opinion on these revivals among your leaders. This has been fully manifested, and even published to the world. The circumstances are briefly these. About three years ago, a mighty effort was made to get up an extensive revival. In the state of New York, the most unprincipled measures were adopted, and the most disgraceful scenes were transacted. The leaders of this work were Messrs Beman and Finney. Dr Beecher and his coadjutors in New England had already succeeded in producing some considerable excitement. They feared an explosion would take place, should the proceedings of the New York revivalists be known in this vicinity. They accordingly wrote Dr Beman a long letter on the subject, and urged him to desist from such dangerous practices. This gave offence; and eventually led to the famous New Lebanon convention, to which twenty-four of the leaders were invited by Messrs. Beecher and Beman. The object of the meeting was 'to see in what respects there is an agreement, between brethren from different sections of the country, *in regard to principles and measures 'in conducting and promoting revivals of religion.'* Resolutions were offered on each side, de-

signed to condemn the conduct of the other. Take the following one of Dr Beecher and his friends. 'There may be so much human infirmity, and indiscretion, and wickedness of man, in conducting a revival of religion, as to render the general *evils* which flow from this infirmity, indiscretion, and wickedness of man *greater* than the local and temporary advantages of the revival.' This is precisely my opinion. This was designed to teach Beman that his revival was of this description. Take Beman's answer. 'Attempts to remedy evils which exist in revivals of religion, may, through the infirmity, and indiscretion, and wickednesss of man, do more injury and ruin more souls, than those evils which such attempts are intended to correct.' This was designed as a hint for Dr Beecher to attend to his own business. I have not room for further extracts. The records of the convention are before the world, and exhibit a most remarkable specimen of wrangling, bitterness, hatred and impiety. After spending some eight or ten days in quarrelling, singing and praying, their meeting was dissolved. Their proceedings will remain to posterity, a disgrace to the individuals concerned; a lasting reproach to the cause of Christ, and an unanswerable argument against the divine origin of revivals. For what did these learned divines assemble? Did they wish to prescribe rules for the regulation of the holy spirit? So it must seem, if these revivals are the work of the holy spirit. For they wished to come to some agreement on the 'principles and measures in conducting and promoting revivals.' This very convention demonstrates that these leaders considered such excitements to be under their own control. Can you believe they were authorized to adopt measures for the better regulation of the holy spirit? No. Then you will allow that these revivals are not the special work of God, but the natural result of human wickedness and management.

8. In the eighth place, you know the effects of these revivals are not what the apostle describes as the fruits of the spirit. He assures us that love, joy, peace, long-suffering, gentleness, goodness, faith, meekness and temperance are the fruits of the spirit. You must admit that a great share of hatred, sorrow, dissension, reviling, unkindness, wickedness, unbelief, passion and intemperate language and conduct has been the unfailing attendant of orthodox excitements. Look at those which raged so extensively in New York three years ago. The orthodox ministers in that state ragard them as most wonderful displays of divine power. But how did Dr Beecher and his friends consider them? Dr Nettleton, the greatest revival preacher of the New England party, makes these remarks concerning them. 'A number of churches have experienced a revival of anger, wrath, malice, envy, and evil speaking, without the knowledge of a single conversion.' Speaking of preachers of that region, he uses this language. 'They do cultivate, and awake in others, what very much resembles the passion of anger, wrath, malice, envy, and evil speaking.' And what are the words of Dr Beecher in relation to the same excitement? It is this. 'It is a spirit of fanaticism, of spiritual pride, censoriousness, and insubordination to the order of the gospel.' Now if Dr Beecher could see such evils in the New York orthodox revivals, is it strange that we see greater evils in the New England revivals; *we*, who do not regard them as the special work of the holy spirit? And above all, look at what is doing at the present moment. The same scenes are acting over again in New York; yes, the same most disgraceful scenes. And still you are reading from your pulpits letters and statements from those very actors in order to get up a revival in Boston and the vicinity. Not only so. You are introducing many of their very measures which you so severely censured three years ago. You are having your anxious seats, and anxious meetings, and four day

meetings, and a long list of other equally unscriptural and unwarrantable measures. You will not then call me uncharitable, if I apply the same language to the fruits of your over zealous labors, that Dr Beecher and his friends applied to the results of Beman's and Finney's exertions. I say you are promoting, 'a revival of anger, wrath, malice, envy, and evil speaking;' and surely these are not the fruits of the spirit. So that you must admit that these revivals are not the special work of the holy spirit, but the natural product of your new and unscriptural means.

9. In the ninth place, these revivals are precisely what you would expect from the measures adopted. There is no occasion to resort to special divine agency for an explanation of a single circumstance; for every particular of the excitement can be satisfactorily explained on perfectly natural principles. Take a few examples. In every revival you know that many, who are as thoroughly excited as any of the converts; who feel as deep convictions of sin as any; who are brought out as clearly as any; who relate as wonderful experiences as any; who give as satisfactory evidence of conversion as any, soon fall away and call the whole business a delusion. Now what produced such effects on these persons? The special operation of the holy spirit? No. You cannot admit this; for you hold that all on whose heart the spirit has exerted a special influence will never fall from grace. Then you must allow that the means used to promote the revival produced all these striking results. Very well. If the means used have produced these clear marks of conversion in so many cases, why not in all the instances? Perhaps you will say that the others persevere in the ways of well doing. And do not thousands in every denomination exhibit equal or greater fruits of christian holiness who never experienced any such excitement, and who reject the orthodox doctrines. You must acknowledge that all the characteristics of the revivals are produced by the means

used; by an appeal to the fears and hopes and sympathies of the converts; by combined exertions, and peculiar circumstances, and religious considerations. So that there is nothing special or supernatural in the whole process.

Take another illustration. You know it frequently happens that those, who have been converted at one revival, and who have been exemplary christians for several years, are again converted in another excitement. Not a few orthodox ministers and deacons are to be ranked in this class. They declare that their former experiences were all a delusion; and that they now feel assured that the special influences of the spirit have been exerted on their hearts. Now, if the first conversion was merely the effect of the means used, why is not the second or third? Were not their experiences equally striking and convincing the first time as the last? Does their conduct furnish any better evidence in the last case than in the first? No. The whole mystery is solved in one word. Their peculiar thoughts and feelings were the natural consequence of the influences to which they were exposed. They supposed them to be the production of the holy spirit; and this mistake led to the reconversion. And you may cause persons of exciteable temperament, who hold to this belief, to pass through a new regeneration as often as you can get up a general excitement, even if it should happen every month. You see then, that our experiences furnish no rational or scriptural evidence of the special operation of the holy spirit; but their frequent recurrence when exposed to similar influences furnishes positive proof to the contrary.

But this is not all. Many, who are now members of Unitarian churches, and preachers in the Unitarian denomination, were converted in your revivals. They gave as certain evidence of their regeneration as any of those who still adhere to Calvinism. They were ad-

mitted to your communions, and for years maintained an irreproachable standing. They searched the scriptures seriously and patiently. They could find none of the peculiar doctrines of orthodoxy; but were compelled by the most convincing scriptural evidence to embrace Unitarianism. They openly confessed the result of their honest convictions, and cheerfully submitted to your manifold persecutions for the cause of truth and righteousness. You could see no diminution in their piety or holiness. They once believed in the divine origin of your excitements. They can now account satisfactorily for every effect produced, on natural causes. They now believe them to be the result of well contrived human machinery. They have the evidence of reason, experience, observation, and scripture on their side. Now how will you explain this fact in consistency with your views of the special operation of the spirit? Will you say that these distinguished individuals were not really converted? This you will hardly dare to affirm, for you know they related as good experiences as any of your converts; you know they exhibited as genuine fruits of repentance as any who were received to your churches; you know their characters, the only scriptural evidence of regeneration, are as good now as when they believed your doctrinal opinions, and as good, to say the least, as any who remain in your communion. Will you say they were truly converted, and are still worthy christians, notwithstanding their Unitarian sentiments? This you will scarcely dare to admit; for you hope to gain some advantage to your party by denying Unitarians the christian name, although in this particular you will eventually find yourself greatly mistaken. Will you say they have fallen from grace. This you dare not acknowledge; for it is contrary to your creed; and you well know that many more of your converts would fall from grace in this same manner, were they exposed to Unitarian influences and permitted to reach the scriptures *unshackled.* Hence your great anxiety to keep hope-

fully pious students from Harvard University; and hence your exertions to prevent your professors from associating with Unitarian companions, and hence your human creeds and enslaving oaths and obligations. Well, you may take which alternative you please. In either case, you will be obliged to acknowledge the human origin of your revivals. For the experiences of this most respectable class of the community are not to be answered with a sneer, or an assertion. There is nothing therefore in your religious excitements but what can be satisfactorily and perfectly explained on natural principles; and the evidence against their divine origin is conclusive and unanswerable. I have said that these revivals are precisely what you would expect from the means used. I must qualify this expression a little. Nothing surprises me more, than that so little effect is produced and so little disturbance created by such bold, daring, unscriptural measures. I want no stronger argument than this against total depravity, and in favor of the purity and dignity of human nature. If the ignorant and uneducated can withstand this unhallowed ordeal, it is satisfactory proof to my mind, that there is something within them of a high, noble, divine origin.

10. In the tenth place, your revivals are promoted as the last expedient for maintaining the sinking cause of orthodoxy. Believing your views of religion to be true and important, you are doubtless anxious to have them preserved and perpetuated. Three methods have been adopted for securing a reception of your theological sentiments. The first is education. This has proved a very efficient and successful method in former years; but its efficacy is greatly diminished at the present period. For when your children arrive at a proper age, they go into society; they exercise their common sense; they associate with liberal companions; they apply their reason to the study of the scriptures, and perhaps they read unitarian publications. In this way, they triumph over the misty, unintelligible, and

mysterious doctrines of Calvinism, and embrace rational and scriptural views of religion. How many parents could I name, whose children are decidedly liberal.

To this important means of perpetuating your peculiar notions, great attention is still given. Even the babes in your infant schools are indoctrinated into the belief of the trinity and other kindred absurdities. But all this does not secure the desired object. The spirit of free inquiry is abroad in the land; and most of those who dare to submit to its influence, are carried away from the creeds and confessions, and inventions of the dark ages. The second method is conviction from investigation. But can you point to an individual in our community, of unprejudiced mind, of good understanding, of upright and honest motives, who has been led to embrace orthodoxy by a candid examination of the scriptures? No; such an occurrence would be considered almost miraculous. The last resort then must be made to revivals. Yes; your leaders have repeatedly declared, that your only hope was in revivals; that the only hope of the church was in revivals; that the only hope of the ministry was in revivals. This declaration discloses the secret. *Revivals are the only hope of the orthodox.* How so? Because you can induce people to receive orthodox doctrines without evidence, when your excitement has benumbed their reason and common sense. When you can make them profess their hearty belief in all the articles of your long creed, and solemnly promise to make this human formulary their standard of religious truth. When their mental strength is thus prostrated, you can bind them to perpetual servitude, and rivet on the chains of your party, and brand their very souls with the stamp of Calvinism. And in no other way can your cause be maintained. Hence the uncommon effort of the present moment to create an extensive excitement. Hence the request of Dr Wisner to his people, to have them bring all their friends and acquaintances *who knew not* Christ; or in other words, all they

could obtain from unitarian societies. Hence the cruel and barbarous treatment of the unitarian lady from the country, whose case has been recently published; and a thousand other circumstances of a similar nature. Were not the object of this new and great and general movement well understood by our community, I would prove more fully that it is designed to save the sinking cause of orthodoxy. Now can you believe, that when your religious opinions cannot be preserved and perpetuated by the means and measures of God's ordination, he will appear in a special, supernatural, miraculous manner to uphold orthodoxy? If you cannot, then you will admit that these revivals are not the work of his holy spirit, but the combined exertions of your leaders.

11. In the eleventh place, the Bible furnishes us with no account of such revivals. No such measures as you now adopt, were ever adopted in the times of prophets or apostles, for the conversion of sinners or unbelievers. No such results as now follow the operation of your human contrivances, ever attended their means of spiritual renovation and improvement. Nothing of the kind can be found from the first word in Genesis to the last sentence in Revelation. But the scriptures furnish us with accounts of several real revivals of religion. I will examine three of the most important, in order to establish my positions. In the book of Nehemiah you find a very full and interesting statement on this question. The people were greatly in need of religious instruction and improvement. The Lord selected Ezra as the revival preacher of the period. Let us now hear what method he adopted to increase true religion. These are the precious words of the sacred writer.

'And Ezra the priest brought the law before the congregation both of men and women, and all that could hear with understanding, upon the first day of the seventh month. And he read therein before the street

that was before the water gate from the morning until midday, before the men and the women, and those that could understand; and the ears of all the people were attentive unto the book of the law. And Ezra the scribe stood upon a pulpit of wood, which they had made for the purpose. And Ezra opened the book in the sight of all the people; and when he opened it all the people stood up; and Ezra blessed the Lord, the great God. And all the people answered, Amen, Amen, with lifting up their hands, and worshipped the Lord with their faces to the ground. And the Levites caused the people to understand the law; and the people stood in their place. So they read in the book in the law of God distinctly, and gave the sense, and caused them to understand the reading. And Ezra the priest the scribe, and the Levites that taught the people, said unto all the people—This day is holy unto the Lord your God; mourn not, nor weep; for all the people wept when they heard the words of the law. Then he said unto them, Go your way, eat the fat, and drink the sweet, and send portions unto them for whom nothing is prepared; for this day is holy unto our Lord; neither be ye sorry; for the joy of the Lord is your strength. So the Levites stilled all the people, saying, hold your peace, for the day is holy; neither be ye grieved. And all the people went their way to eat, and to drink, and to send portions, and to make great mirth, because they had understood the words that were declared unto them.'

Here then we have a very clear account of a most important and truly scriptural revival of religion. It bears no resemblance whatever to your modern excitements, but differs from them most essentially in several striking particulars. And first, you notice that the law of God, all the Bible they then possessed, was made the only standard of religious instruction. It is well known that in your modern revivals, the Bible is almost *altogether* neglected, or perverted to sectarian purposes. *In proof* of this assertion I give you the fol-

lowing sentences from a worthy orthodox church-member who took an active part in the early stages of the famous New York excitement. 'But fortunately for the suffering Bible, but very few quotations were made from it; I think not as many in three months, as I have heard in a single sermon! The Bible must bend to accommodate the subject, rather than the subject to comply with the Bible. Passages not congenial to the spirit of the times, or passages which seemed to carry on their face a palpable contradiction of any favorite topic, must be introduced, lest the people should be led from them, to distrust the positions which they seemed to contradict. And here the powers of ingenuity were put to the rack, to bring these passages to comply with the design of the preacher.' Read the whole of Brockway's delineation of the characteristic features of a revival of religion in Troy. And secondly, you notice that the congregation was composed of *men*, women, and children; whereas but few males are to be seen in your various meetings for the outpouring of the spirit. And third, you notice that the priest read the law distinctly, and then gave the true meaning to the people; whereas your mode of communicating instruction is by exhortation, denunciation and declamation. And fourth, you notice the preachers told their hearers not to weep, or grieve, or be sorry; whereas your principal object seems to be to excite tears, and grief, and sorrow, and expression, and lamentation, and wailing. And, fifth, you notice that the ministers directed their people to go home, and eat, drink and be merry; whereas your advice seems to be for them to remain at meeting as many hours as possible, to fast as long as nature will permit, and to banish all mirth, and rejoicing, and gladness. And, sixth, you notice the leaders ordered their society to send portions to the destitute; whereas your direction seems to be for them to send sectarian tracts, a most unwelcome portion, calculated to excite disgust rather than gratitude. I hope you

and all your friends will carefully examine the means and nature of this Jewish revival.

Look next at a true revival of religion produced by the preaching of our Saviour. 'And seeing the multitudes, he went up into a mountain; and when he was set, his disciples came unto him.' And he opened his mouth, and taught them, saying.—Saying what?—'That in the Godhead are three persons, the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost; and that these three are one God, the same in substance, equal in power and glory? No. Saying what?—'That the only Redeemer of the elect is the eternal son of God, who for this purpose became man, and continues to be God and man in two distinct natures and one person forever?' No. Saying what?—'That the burden of damnation, from which we were delivered, was laid upon Christ; that it was requisite he should feel the severity of the divine vengeance, in order to appease the wrath of God; that the design and end of this oblation was to atone, pacify, and reconcile God, by giving him a full and adequate compensation or satisfaction for the sins of his elect?' No. Saying what?—'That by the decree of God, for the manifestation of his glory, some men and angels are predestinated unto everlasting life, and others foreordained unto everlasting death; that these angels and men, thus predestinated and foreordained, are particularly and unchangeably designed; and their number is so certain and definite, that it cannot be either increased or diminished?' No. Saying what?—'That from the original corruption of man, whereby we are utterly indisposed, disabled, and made opposite to all good, and wholly inclined to all evil, do proceed all actual transgressions.' No. Saying what?—'That the wicked in hell will not be able in that conflict to overcome their enemy, and to deliver themselves; that God will then undertake to deal with them, will gird himself with might to execute wrath, will be their *enemy, and will* act the part of an enemy with a wit-

is requested not hastily to ascribe it to the prejudice or partiality of the writer, for he is not conscious of having had respect to persons or arguments, either as moderator or reporter. His sole object has been to present to all concerned, an impartial account, exhibiting the whole strength of the arguments adduced by both parties, in such manner as, he flatters himself, would be approved, for fidelity and accuracy, by those who were present at the public discussion. If, therefore, the reader should find that on some occasions the discourses of the controvertists contain little that can be considered as pertinent, argumentative, or conclusive; the deficiency must be ascribed to its proper cause, as it cannot be considered the duty of the historian to create, or polish the facts of which he treats; but rather to present them as they really subsist, to the mind of the reader. This is our apology where, in the following pages, little is said concerning the discourses, or arguments of one of the speakers. Nor does the writer conceive, that a faithful discharge of his duty required him to omit all that he believed to be deficient in force of argument, or inapplicable to the occasion. If, therefore, some of the speeches seem to have contained but little that is appropriate to the subject, or to manifest an acrimony of feeling or expression unbecoming the Christian character and temper, their admittance into the pages of this report must be ascribed to the writer's desire to preserve the prominent features of the discussion.

The object of this narrative is not to fatigue the reader with a relation of heterogeneous matter and irrelevant disputations that have no bearing on the subject, but to preserve such a selection as may produce in the minds of readers, the same effect which the several speeches made on the hearers, at the time they were delivered. To accomplish this end, is the design of the writer, and in accordance with the desire of the public's sincere and obedient servant,

ISAAC C. GOFF.

relation of wonderful experiences, or for subscribing to human creeds. No. They believed one point, the Messiahship of Jesus; and to him were they directed as their only master in matters of religion. Examine the whole account for yourself, and see if you can find the faintest resemblance to one single feature in your modern excitements. Sir, the example and instructions of our Saviour and his apostles furnish the most satisfactory and unanswerable argument for the human origin of your revivals. Let any man in his sober senses examine the record of their doings and sayings, and he must be convinced of this truth; for he cannot find one circumstance in their whole history to justify the praying, preaching, visiting, conversing and acting of orthodox leaders. And can it be, that your revivals, which are condemned by every page of the Bible, are the special work of the holy spirit?

12. Finally, such are some of my reasons for believing that orthodox revivals are the effects of human agency, and not the special work of the holy spirit. These arguments appear to my mind altogether unanswerable. I have endeavored to notice all the evidence by which your positions are supported. If anything important has been omitted, it has been altogether unintentional on my part. The three main sources of proof for your belief on this question, I have however noticed but incidentally. I will now give them a more full consideration. To prove that your revivals are the special work of the holy spirit, you first appeal to the *feelings* of your converts. This is dangerous testimony; for it proves too much, and consequently is worse than nothing. The Mahometan *feels* that his religion is from heaven. The Swedenborgian *feels* that his Master was divinely commissioned. The Shaker *feels* that his animal excitement is the operation of the Almighty. The deluded fanatic *feels* that his crazy dreams are the suggestions of divine wisdom, or that his contortions and writhings are the special work

of the holy spirit. And so, I might say, of many other religionists; and if *feeling* is satisfactory evidence in one case, it must be in all. And above all, I might appeal to the multitude of Unitarians, who have been converted in your revivals, and whose *feelings* now teach them that your excitements are not the special work of the holy spirit; and whose Bibles instruct them that this kind of evidence furnishes no satisfactory proof of the truth of your position.

But in the second place, you appeal to remarkable instances of conversion. You aver that scoffing and irreligious persons, calling themselves Deists, or Universalists, or Unitarians, or Episcopalians, have occasionally been brought into the christian fold by your revivals. Admit the fact, and what does it prove? Nothing to your purpose. For according to your own account, these individuals were destitute of piety. If so, their conscience was against their practice, and in favor of religion. Notwithstanding their sneers, they were uneasy in their own souls. They were the very persons of all others to be frightened into a surrender, when exposed to the peculiar artillery of your warfare. Nothing but the thunders of Sinai, and the brimstone of the burning lake, could arouse the sensibilities of their depraved hearts. I could wish, that more of this class were exposed to the various influences which you bring into operation on such occasions. And those very examples I should quote in proof of my belief in the human origin of your revivals. For your causes, your machinery, are perfectly adequate to the effects produced, to the work accomplished. And when you remember that most of this description, who give such good evidence of conversion in the season of excitement, afterwards fall away and become ten fold more the children of hell, you will perceive that my argument from this source is doubly fortified.

But after all, you appeal to the lives of your best converts, in proof of the special operation of the holy

spirit. Now if you could prove from reason and scripture that the heart of man is totally depraved, and that the supernatural influence of the Deity is absolutely essential to its conversion to holiness, and that your disciples are truly regenerated, your argument would have some weight. But the two first propositions never have been established, and I am fully persuaded, they never will be, while God remains unchangeable. Not only so. Look into your own denomination. Read the lives of your most pious members. You will find that much the largest proportion of those who have done most honor to the religion of Jesus, never passed through any such excitement, never knew the time or manner of their conversion, never knew the period when they did not love their Father in heaven, and endeavor to keep his commandments. Look into the unitarian church. You may find no small number of individuals who exhibit as much scriptural evidence, to say the least, of being the true disciples of Jesus, as any in the orthodox ranks. They have no belief in the necessity of a miraculous influence of the holy spirit on the human soul in order to its regeneration. They make no pretences to any experiences of this nature. And to what source will you attribute their goodness? They indeed receive the scriptural doctrines of conversion and divine influences. They believe that the spirit helpeth our infirmities. They cherish this belief with gratitude. And if the common influences of the holy spirit are sufficient for so many, why not for all?

But one argument more, and I have done with this division. The reasons frequently assigned by some of your leaders for promoting revivals are demonstrative proof of their human origin. And what are some of the most remarkable? Why, the sale of pews in a new orthodox church; the means for supporting an orthodox minister; the destruction of the unitarian heresy, and others of an equally party nature. I, therefore, call upon you, and all your adherents, to examine my arguments

on this question; to consider my facts on this subject; and either to answer my defence with more powerful evidence, or submit to my conclusion.

V. You assert that those who oppose orthodox revivals are enemies to the cause of Christ. I think a plain statement of facts will prove your assertion untrue; and also convince you, that the opposers to your excitements are wholly devoted to the promotion of pure and undefiled religion.

1. In the first place, who have been the opposers of orthodox revivals? The most distinguished of the orthodox themselves. Yes; read the history of our pious fathers. They knew nothing of such excitements until the days of Whitefield. They resolutely opposed his new and unscriptural measures. Their opposition continued until within a few years, except by a minority. And at the present moment, no small number of your more judicious professors are unwilling to adopt your singular modes of operation, and do not hesitate to express their decided disapprobation of your proceedings. I wish it were in my power to present you with an extract from a discourse, delivered at the ordination of Mr Albro, by the Rev Mr Withington. A more decided attack upon your whole system of revivals was never uttered. Not only so. Look to the Episcopal denomination. You will allow their creed to be sufficiently evangelical. But you know they have opposed your revivals with an almost unanimous voice. Above all, look to Scotland. From the days of Knox to the present reign of Chalmers, you find no revivalists in that most learned and pious orthodox denomination. I could refer you to multitudes more who adhere to the articles of your creed, but who are open opposers to your excitements. And will you rank all these orthodox christians of past and present generations among the enemies of Christ? Will you not admit that many of this number have done more for the cause of what you consider pure religion, than any of

your revival leaders? Is not your assertion altogether untrue and slanderous. But you meant to condemn Unitarians. Very well.

2. In the second place, why do Unitarians oppose your revivals? I answer for myself. I have been in the midst of your excitements. I have experienced something of their power and influence. I have had a fair view of their operation on human beings. I have witnessed their pernicious effects on many individuals. I believe they are produced by unscriptural measures. I believe they yield unchristian fruit. I believe they are the special work of men and women. I know that many of the best and ablest orthodox divines have entertained this same belief on these several questions. I must therefore act in consistency with my convictions. I conscientiously oppose their existence and prevalence. I do this from the best of motives; from a regard to the plain instructions of my Saviour. I wish to banish all such unhallowed commotions from the land. I believe this can be done in one way, and in but one way. Convince people that their experiences in seasons of excitement are not the *special* work of the holy spirit, and the desired work is accomplished. Convince them that God does not exert a supernatural influence in the conversion of sinners, and the reign of fanaticism will have received a death blow. Convince them that all their thoughts and feelings in times of a revival are the natural effect of the means used and measures adopted, and your papers will forever be filled with lamentations for the withdrawal of divine, miraculous influences. To effect this object, has been the design of my present undertaking. I have presented evidence enough to satisfy any rational and candid mind. But I do not expect complete success at present. There is great ignorance in the community. Many dare not look into the facts on this question. Many will be deterred by your leaders from reading this and similar publications. But the increasing evil of these excitements will become more and

more evident as the difficulty in producing them increases. Look into the Western States, and see what this very principle of special agency, is doing for the Mormonites. Unless this error is banished from christendom, many most alarming transactions will be made the occasion of christian lamentation. Having stated my views fully and distinctly, I now say that I am not opposing a revival of pure and undefiled religion. No. This is the grand object of all my thoughts, desires, prayers and exertions; and may God crown them with desired success.

3. In the third place, how can a revival of pure and undefiled religion be produced. In but one way. The work must be accomplished by christians. A great and mighty reformation must begin at the house of God. First, the Bible and the Bible alone, must be made the standard, and the only standard, of christian faith and practice; and all human creeds, confessions, formularies of faith must be banished from the world. Secondly, all who profess to be followers of Christ must be contented with the single name of Christian; and all the appellations which have been derived from human invention of doctrinal opinions must be forgotten. Thirdly, all Christians must judge each other by the christian rule; by their fruits, their conduct, and not by their party names or sentiments; and acknowledge all as brethren who receive Jesus as their Master, and exhibit a virtuous character. Fourthly, all Christians must obey the commands of the Saviour, and endeavor to do towards each other in all things as they would have others do unto them; and in this way cause all to forget their differences of opinion and unite on the common ground of salvation. Until these things have taken place, christendom will experience no very valuable or extensive revival of pure religion; and when these things are accomplished, the irreligious and unbelieving world will be drawn into the fold, by the example and writings of *such consistent* followers of the meek and lowly Jesus.

4. I have thus given you my honest reasons for believing your five assertions untrue. If you wish for certificates to establish any of my positions, they shall be readily furnished. I hope you will seriously consider my statements and arguments, and either acknowledge the conclusion to which they lead, or return a satisfactory answer. I have endeavored to speak with great plainness of language; for the subject and occasion demand frankness and honesty. I suppose you will call some of my remarks severe; but are they more severe than truth and justice exact? Is not the following extract from the pious Richard Baxter somewhat applicable to certain professors? 'It is one of the most dangerous diseases of professors, and greatest scandals of this age, that persons taken for eminently religious, are more impatient of plain, though just reproof, than many a drunkard, swearer, or fornicator. And when they have spent hours or days in the seeming earnest confession of their sin, and lament before God and man that they cannot do it with more grief and tears; yet they take it for a heinous injury in another that will say half so much against them, and take him for a malignant enemy of the Godly who will call them as they call themselves. They wish that the chief business of a preacher should be to praise them, and set them above the rest, as the only people of God; and they take him for an enemy that will tell them the truth. But the scandal is greatest in those preachers themselves, who cannot endure to hear that they are sinners. So tender and impatient of reproof are some, yea, some that for their learning, and preaching, and piety, are ranked in the highest form, or expect to be so, that almost nothing but flattery or praise can please them; and they can hardly bear the gentlest reproof, no, nor a contradiction of any of their opinions.

Yours respectfully.

BERNARD WHITMAN.

Waltham, May, 1831.

A FAITHFUL

REPORT

OF THE

Theological Debate

HELD AT MILFORD, NEW-JERSEY,

DECEMBER, 1830,

BY

REV. W. L. M'CALLA,

OF THE

PRESBYTERIAN,

AND

ELDER W. LANE,

OF THE

CHRISTIAN CONNEXION,

CAREFULLY COLLECTED FROM NOTES TAKEN BY DIFFERENT PERSONS DURING THE DISCUSSION, AND PREPARED FOR THE PRESS,

BY ISAAC C. GOFF,

One of the Moderators.

NEW-YORK:

Printed at the Office of D. Mitchell, No. 23, Harman-Street.

1831.

PREFACE.

PERHAPS we owe to the religious community some apology, for unavoidable and unexpected delay in presenting this Report for their information, relative to the management and result of this public debate, of which they have had various and somewhat discordant accounts through the medium of the newspapers. But as these notices which have been offered to the public, have been prepared and inserted in the public prints by the zealous and interested friends of the parties, they have, perhaps, been too partial to give a fair and just impression of facts as they really occurred, during the four memorable days of the discussion at Milford. The public are, therefore, requested to give the following Report a careful perusal, and we doubt not that they will form a more accurate opinion, than that which they may have been induced to adopt by several of the incorrect and sectarian rumours, that have been artfully put into circulation to forestall public sentiment. At the anxious solicitude of Mr. M'Calla's friends, none will be surprised, when they read the following Report of the Debate. All who felt friendly to his side of the question, doubtlessly perceived the propriety of his premature withdrawal from the scene of action, and the importance of redeeming his fallen honour, by a last effort to anticipate the effects of an impartial Report, on the feelings and opinions of the religious world.

The first notice that appeared in the public papers after the abrupt close of the discussion, claimed the laurel of fame for Mr. M'Calla, *both as to manner and matter*. The friends of Mr. Lane never indulged the hope, that he should appear in the flowers of rhetoric and classical allusion, an equal to the far-famed champion; but in

matter they now feel and believe, as they previously hoped, that Mr. Lane would not yield to the talents nor arrogance of his assuming opponent.

As Mr. M'Calla's friends continued to circulate in the public papers, these preposterous and disguised reports, endeavouring thereby to prejudice and prepossess the public feeling, it was thought necessary to give some precaution to the readers of the *newspapers*, through which the misrepresentations had been diffused; and, accordingly, the following LETTER was addressed to the Editor of the "Northampton Whig," in which paper the first of these exulting and bombastic notices made its appearance :—

Alexandria, Jan. 22, 1831.

"He that is first in his own cause seemeth just,
But his neighbour cometh and searcheth him."
Solomon.

Mr. Editor,—In looking over your paper of the 12th ultimo, I find an article purporting to be a history of the recent theological discussion at Milford, between Messrs. McCalla and Lane. That this article contains a *libel* upon the faith of Mr. Lane, and a respectable body of professed Christians with whom he stands connected, is *too* obvious to every *impartial person who has become acquainted with the sentiments of the people, to require even one testimony in evidence.*

It is stated in the article referred to, that Mr. Lane belongs to a sect calling themselves Christians, and who *deny the divinity of our Saviour.* That Mr. Lane, or the society to which he belongs, denies the divinity of our Saviour, is *not true.* As a denomination of Christians we believe, and as ministers we have always taught, that Jesus Christ was the *divine Son of God,*—"the *only begotten* Son of God;" "the only name given under heaven or among men whereby we can be saved." In short, that he is the *divine* INSTRUMENT, by whom *God* the *Father* made the world, redeems man, and will finally judge the secrets of all hearts. That Jesus Christ is not the author of the creation, redemption, and final judgment; but the *mediate cause by whom God*

the Father effects these great works, we think is a doctrine which was established by Mr. Lane, to the *entire satisfaction* of a *very great majority of the people, by proof incontrovertible.* That there is but *one God the Father*, (*not Father, Son, and Holy Ghost,*) according to the plain declaration of the apostle Paul, 1 Cor. 8, 6, and one Lord Jesus Christ, *by whom* we approach this one God, is a doctrine urged by Mr. Lane, *founded upon arguments* that Mr. M'Calla *did not meet, and arguments that we believe no trinitarian can answer.*

It is further stated in that article, that "Mr. M'Calla's *triumph was complete*, both as to *matter* and *manner!*" If your informants were present during the four days' discussion, is it possible that their *senses so much deceived them?* At the close of the fourth day, after *numerous ineffectual efforts* on the part of Mr. M'Calla to sustain his proposition, he *publicly gave up the debate.* The Hon. Cornelius Ludlow, (president of the board of moderators,) then asked the question, "Mr. M'Calla, do you relinquish the debate?" Mr. M'Calla rejoined, "*I do for ever!*" The president then publicly announced that Mr. M'Calla had relinquished the debate, and according to the rules of discussion, Mr. Lane had a right to proceed until he was satisfied. But this your *informants understand*, to be a "*complete triumph*" *for Mr. M'Calla!* Possibly your informants understood the shout, "*the great Mr. M'Calla, the champion of the trinitarians, is completely beaten by a boy!*" to be an important *note in the song of Mr. M'Calla's triumph.*

But when the streets of the little village rang with "*the Trinity is down*," and one of Mr. M'Calla's moderators threatened to prosecute the people for *celebrating his defeat*, did your informants understand all this to be but the *lofty notes* of *applause amidst which Mr. M'Calla was bearing off the palm of victory!!* If a "*complete triumph*" produced such *death-like paleness* as sat upon his countenance, while he pressed his way from the *field of action*, with *large drops of sweat following hard upon each other down his visage, the ominous index of disappointment*, we have reason to doubt

whether he could have possibly *survived the impending defeat.*

Your informants said truly, that Mr. Clough, of the same denomination of Mr. Lane, challenged Mr. M'Calla to a disputation of the same subject, (*which challenge was given on the morning previous to the opening of the late discussion,*) and that Mr. M'Calla *did accept it.* But if they had told the whole truth, they would have informed you also, that Mr. M'Calla, at the close of the fourth day, after *publicly reading Mr. Clough's challenge and his acceptance,* told the audience he *could not meet Mr. Clough:* assigning as a reason, that Mr. Clough had *smiled.* The whole congregation, almost without exception, *had smiled repeatedly* during the discussion; but in none was the *act considered unpardonable* but in Mr. Clough. The fact is, it is generally believed, *that Mr. M'Calla dare not meet Mr. Clough upon that subject.* As an evidence of this, Mr. M'Calla was there *publicly branded a coward by Mr. Clough!!* But this, probably, was only another *laurel* in the judgment of your *informants,* for their *unmatched disputant;* and, indeed, I am unable to conjecture what, in their estimation, could have *tarnished* the *glory of his "splendid triumph!"*

ONE OF THE MODERATORS.

We whose names follow, being present during the whole discussion between Messrs. M'Calla and Lane, do hereby certify that the above is a *fair representation* of the debate, and its *termination.*

JOHN DUCKWORTH.
SIMON CLOUGH.

We cannot commit the following Report to the public, without noticing a communication to the *Philadelphian,* a religious paper published at Philadelphia, by the connexion to which Mr. M'Calla belongs. The language and spirit of that communication, are such as ought to

have precluded its insertion in a sober and serious publication; and we confess, it was with no small surprise that we found it in a paper conducted by the Rev. Dr. Ely, whose discernment and respectability we should have imagined to be a sufficient guarantee against the circulation of such a fulsome, disgusting, and unholy composition.

From the Christian Index.

THEOLOGICAL DEBATE.

"In consequence of a notice of a theological debate, which was published some weeks ago in the Philadelphian, the curiosity of your numerous readers has been a good deal excited. With many this excitement was of no ordinary kind. The subject of debate was the very foundation-stone of Christianity; and the combatants were men high in the estimation of their respective friends. Mr. LANE, the Unitarian combatant, was so fully satisfied of his own theological prowess, that for a length of time he was vaporing before the christian world, and literally defying the armies of the living God. His challenge was generally directed "to any man of the great leading sects in the United States." Having repeatedly challenged our American Israel, and received no reply, he began to swell into immense importance, both in his own estimation and that of his friends. As his challenges were reiterated, and with increasing energy, his confidence grew amazingly, until, in fact, both he and his followers began to blow the trumpet of victory, and enter upon the spoils of conquest. But at length, on a fatal day, when the leaven of vanity had arisen to its acme, he penned a challenge which was put into the hands of the Rev. W. L. M'CALLA. You might as well expect a Kentuckian to refuse a challenge, as Mr. M'Calla to stand aloof when the great Captain of his salvation calls him to the support of any post. Like a soldier always equipt, and ready for the word, he accepted the invitation, and in your paper, the time and place of meeting, together with the names and opinions of the parties, were advertised. That Mr. M'Calla is a man of no common mental calibre in theological

discussions, you are well aware; and this fact, in connection with the point in debate, did beget in the public mind an intense interest. But how has this desire been satisfied?—not a word has ever appeared to tell whether the meeting took place, or if it did, how it resulted. The public are left entirely in the dark, and very much dissatisfied. From the language used by the gentleman who wrote the notice, I have no doubt many, as well as myself, were led to expect a detailed account. Week after week I have waited for this, until disappointment has at length urged me to take the pen, and in some measure satisfy the christian public.

"The combatants did meet at the village of Milford, twelve miles below Easton, on the Jersey shore of the river Delaware, on Tuesday the 7th of December. Having each chosen two judges, and agreed upon a fifth, who was to act as president, and determined to speak 30 minutes alternately, beginning each day at ten o'clock, A.M. and ending at 3 o'clock, P.M. the debate opened on the morning of Tuesday, and concluded at 3 o'clock on the following Friday. A large concourse of spectators were present, and each disputant was ably supported with a number of friends and brethren. The Unitarian had a brother minister from Rochester, in the state of New York, one from the city of New York, and two or three others from different places. The advocate of the Lord Jesus Christ was surrounded, not only by a number of his own clerical brethren, and sectarian friends, but by ministers and people of the Methodist, and Baptist, and Dutch Reformed denominations. Yes, and what was still more touchingly interesting, two members of his Session, and a pious member of another sect followed him from the city.

"During the first day Mr. M'Calla did little else than drain out of his opponent the system which he embraced. * * * Mr. Lane had the concluding 30 minutes on the first day, and so completely was he deceived in his antagonist, that he actually, in the most pompous and swelling accents, proclaimed a prospective victory. Having pumped him, however, thoroughly dry, the first day, Mr. M'Calla came down upon him and his system

the second day, with the most tremendous and fearful power. If you have ever stood against him in the war of mind, you can form some indistinct opinion at least of what a man of very slender intellect and acquirements must have suffered beneath the united force of Mr. M'Calla's wit, and satire, and argument. Yes, Sir, such was the effect of his tremendous power over the audience, that the very features of Lane's clerical friends, sitting with their backs to him, seemed to be, as if by some secret magic, under the dominion of his spell. When he assailed their system by argument, they would sometimes writhe under the painful weight and certainty with which he struck and bruised it—and when he poured down upon their blasphemies that scathing and withering satire of which he is such a mighty master, they looked as if molten lead were hurled upon them; and then turning from this he would let loose such a torrent of wit, that even their own friends convulsively shook. And, Sir, I may here remark, that whether Mr. M'Calla assailed them by wit, or satire, or argument, he seemed to receive the instrument from the hand of that blessed Master whose cause he was pleading. In his hands they looked as if they had just come from the armory of God. He seemed filled with the Spirit, animated with the ennobling thought that his Jesus permitted him to stand forth in his name, and fired with the holy ambition of walking in the train of a conquering Redeemer. And this was literally the case: both he and his brethren felt themselves strong in the mighty God of Jacob. Independent of other seasons, they spent the hour preceding the debate each morning in social prayer; and they came from the feet of their divine Master to defend his cause. It was a glorious season, and so much favor did God give his champion in the eyes of all his Israel, that we felt as secure in him as we felt in our cause—nor were we disappointed.

"At one time M'Calla drove him to the acknowledgment that God the Father was a *material* being, and then after receiving the awful castigation which such a sentiment deserves, and such an opponent could give, he denied that he said so, and though he described God as a

being who has "a real body and parts, a location, a centre, and a circumference," yet he would deny him to be material. Again he denied that God could fill infinite space, for having a "real body," if he did, there would not be room for any other existence but himself; and yet he would the next moment deny that he said God was material. At one time he would call God the Son, *divine* and *eternal;* and when prest by the argument of Mr. M'Calla, would explain *eternal* as meaning a creation before the commencement of time, and *divine* as the possession of a divine or holy soul! He repeatedly called the adorable Saviour a *creature*, and as repeatedly denied it. Sometimes he was a *delegated*, and again an originated God. And thus he flew under the rod of truth with which Mr. M'Calla so signally chastised him, like Proteus, from one shape to another; sometimes *Socinian*, sometimes *high Arian*, and sometimes *Materialist!* But in his case, as in Kneeland's, Mr. M'Calla providentially had a book, which Lane having recommended, enabled him to pin him down to its absurdities, until at length he was fain even to deny the book; and before all was over, he maintained that he believed it only in part!—Now, Sir, in thus driving him from absurdity to absurdity—exhibiting his true sentiments and their legitimate results—causing him to deny doctrines which he had frequently preached, and reject, at least in part, a book which he repeatedly said "contained his doctrines better than he could express them," every thing which the friends of Jesus expected was almost realized, for he had deceived many by a partial exhibition of his doctrines, and a sophistical explanation of their bearing upon revealed truth.

"After the first day, Lane's speeches were little better than repetitions delivered in a stentorian voice, and the auditors evinced the greatest uneasiness until his half hour terminated. Indeed, on one occasion, I overheard a friend of his exclaim, "how tiresome;" but no sooner did M'Calla's voice sound, than every drooping head became erect—loiterers hurried in, and all eyes and ears were open. He was indeed so instructive, and so entertaining, and so full of wit and repartee, and yet so

evidently actuated by the spirit of his divine Master, that it was a treat of no ordinary kind to hear him.

"At the beginning of the debate, Mr. Clough, their great Corypheus, manœuvred a good deal to get a part, if not the whole of the debate to himself; and when he failed, as a last effort, tendered Mr. M'Calla a challenge to meet him next March in the city of New York, which Mr. M'Calla promptly accepted.——— Towards the conclusion, as Mr. Lane got more and more weak, and Mr. M'Calla grew stronger and weighter, the Unitarians could bear it no longer, and whether by concert or not, Clough interrupted him, and created a general confusion. The judges ordered Clough down; and Mr. M'Calla taking his challenge from his pocket, tore it in pieces; saying, that when he accepted it, he thought it was from a gentleman, but as he found himself so egregiously disappointed, he would take no more notice of it;—adding, however, that if they had a gentleman among their ministers, he would meet him, or any Unitarian of character in the United States, even the great Dr. Channing, of Boston."

It requires all the patience and resolution of which we are possessed, to enable us to notice with any degree of calmness, such frothy bombast, such deliberate and undisguised falsehoods, as show themselves on the face of the above communication. Nay, even the mantle of charity itself, cannot cover the moral deformity of a professed *Eye Witness*, in sending into the world such a contemptible production. Nor can that charity, which hides a multitude of sins, encourage us to admit that piety and truth can deign to dwell in the fellowship of one whose wantonly outrages these characteristics of religion and moral virtue.

It is due to the editor of the "Christian Index" to approbate his conduct in disavowing all intention to countenance the "*bullying style*," in which the communication to the Philadelphian is penned; and we do not feel ourselves obliged to bestow on it greater attention, than merely to point out to the reader some of its prominent features of moral deformity.

In the above paper there occur the following unwarrantable statements: 1. Mr. Lane penned the challenge to Mr. M'Calla; 2. Mr. M'Calla drove Mr. Lane to acknowledge that God is a *material* being; 3. Mr. Lane was sometimes a *Socinian*, and sometimes a *Materialist*; 4. The judges ordered Mr. Clough to come down!

To all concerned, we are authorized to state, that the challenge was penned by a Methodist preacher, and not by Mr. Lane; that the opinions of Elder Lane are not *Socinian*, nor accordant with the doctrine of *Materialism*; and consequently an *Eye Witness* is guilty of gross misrepresentation, clothed in the language of Pharisaic pride, and mock humility, which constitute the utter disgrace of religious pretensions.

We do not essentially dissent from the affirmative, that at the end of the first day, Mr. Lane "*proclaimed a prospective victory.*" In one of the speeches delivered on that day, he furnished all the argument and evidence necessary to establish the negative of the proposition which he undertook to maintain; and as Mr. M'Calla continually avoided a pertinent discussion of the subject, Mr. Lane was necessarily compelled to much repetition, in order to excite his opponent to come to the question which, from all appearance, Mr. M'Calla felt his inability to discuss in a proper manner.

The reader must not expect to find in the following narrative, every minute argument alleged by the disputants, in support of their favourite opinions, concerning the person of our Lord; nor ought they to expect, that this historical sketch should contain the very words and phrases employed by the speakers, in their discussions; for these, we are persuaded, would not have been always preserved by themselves, had they prepared their discourses for the press. But as the Report is compiled from extensive notes, taken by different persons during the debate, we presume it will not fall short of the end contemplated; which is to give the public a fair and impartial account of this interesting controversy. If on the part of him who maintained the affirmative, there should appear a substitution of abusive and uncharitable language, instead of fair and pertinent reasoning, the reader

is requested not hastily to ascribe it to the prejudice or partiality of the writer, for he is not conscious of having had respect to persons or arguments, either as moderator or reporter. His sole object has been to present to all concerned, an impartial account, exhibiting the whole strength of the arguments adduced by both parties, in such manner as, he flatters himself, would be approved, for fidelity and accuracy, by those who were present at the public discussion. If, therefore, the reader should find that on some occasions the discourses of the controvertists contain little that can be considered as pertinent, argumentative, or conclusive; the deficiency must be ascribed to its proper cause, as it cannot be considered the duty of the historian to create, or polish the facts of which he treats; but rather to present them as they really subsist, to the mind of the reader. This is our apology where, in the following pages, little is said concerning the discourses, or arguments of one of the speakers. Nor does the writer conceive, that a faithful discharge of his duty required him to omit all that he believed to be deficient in force of argument, or inapplicable to the occasion. If, therefore, some of the speeches seem to have contained but little that is appropriate to the subject, or to manifest an acrimony of feeling or expression unbecoming the Christian character and temper, their admittance into the pages of this report must be ascribed to the writer's desire to preserve the prominent features of the discussion.

The object of this narrative is not to fatigue the reader with a relation of heterogeneous matter and irrelevant disputations that have no bearing on the subject, but to preserve such a selection as may produce in the minds of readers, the same effect which the several speeches made on the hearers, at the time they were delivered. To accomplish this end, is the design of the writer, and in accordance with the desire of the public's sincere and obedient servant,

ISAAC C. GOFF.

THEOLOGICAL DEBATE.

CORRESPONDENCE.

Philadelphia, Oct. 29, 1830.

Mr. Lane,—I have, this day, received intelligence of the meeting at Milford, and of your public and general challenge there, in the following words, viz. "I challenge any man of the great leading sects, in our country, to debate publicly with me, the following points:—My opponent is to prove, that the Lord Jesus Christ is, really, the Supreme God, and that he is also, man—the two natures being united in one person. I will prove, that the Lord Jesus Christ is not the eternal God." I understand, that you have signed this challenge with your own hand. It appears, therefore, not to be a hasty production, but one, the import of which you have well weighed. It is directed to "any man of the great leading sects in our country." You, doubtless, consider the Presbyterians of the General Assembly to be one of the great leading sects; and can be easily informed in your own neighborhood, that I am a man of that body. Your challenge, then, is directed to me, in common with other men of the Presbyterian, Episcopalian, Congregational, Baptist, or Methodist societies. After prayer, and mature deliberation, I accept your invitation. Permit me, however, merely to propose, that the subject of discussion be in the form of a plain question, of which you can take the negative, and I the affirmative, as follows:—"Is the man, Christ Jesus, the Supreme and Eternal God?" This embraces every idea suggested in your two propositions, and would, therefore, be acceptable to you, if I mistake not. This, however, is left to your discretion. I am willing to meet you on the very words of your challenge, if you prefer them. An answer, as soon as convenient, would oblige

W. L. M'CALLA.

New York, November 4, 1830.

Mr. M'Calla,

Dear Sir,—Yours, of the 29th ult. was received on the first instant, late in the evening; but being under an engagement in New York, which rendered it necessary for me to leave Milford early on Tuesday morning, I have not found it convenient to return an answer till this late period. My challenge, on the evening of which you speak, was given in the following words, viz. :—"I challenge any minister, of acknowledged abilities, in good standing, in any of the popular sects, to debate with me, publicly, the following questions :—

1st. "Is God a trinity of three persons? He to take the affirmative, and I the negative. In opposition to which I will prove, that there is but one God, the Father.

2d. "Is Christ the Supreme and Eternal God? He to take the affirmative, and I the negative. In opposition to which, I will prove, that Jesus Christ is the Son of God." On the next morning, the Reverend Gentlemen, who were present the preceding evening, called upon me, to know if I would put my name to the above challenge. I answered in the affirmative. They then proposed to alter the phrase, "Trinity of persons;" and substitute, in its stead, "personal distinctions," to which alteration I objected, urging, among other reasons, that it was not the language of their Confessions of Faith. I then offered to meet them on the doctrine of the trinity, as expressed in the language of their Confessions of Faith; to which they objected. One of the Reverend Gentlemen then wrote the challenge mentioned in your letter, which I afterwards signed, as they would agree to nothing else. Having thus given you an outline of the history of this challenge, I will now answer directly to your letter. I am willing, Sir, to meet you on the plain question, in your own language, viz.: "Is the man, Christ Jesus, the Supreme and Eternal God?"—you taking the affirmative and I the negative.

WM. LANE.

RULES OF CONFERENCE,

Adopted and signed this 7th day of December, 1830, in Milford, New Jersey, by Wm. Lane, and W. L. M'Calla.—

1. The proposition for discussion shall be the following, viz. "Is the man, Christ Jesus, the Supreme and Eternal God?"

2. The discussion shall be moderated by five men: each of the parties choosing two, and these four choosing a fifth, who is not to be a member of any church, and who is to be considered the President of the Bench.

3. The Bench is not to decide the merits of the question, nor the weight of argument, nor the ultimate length of the debate; but they are to keep order, and settle points of order according to these written rules.

4. The parties shall be entitled to alternate addresses of thirty minutes.

5. The discussion to commence on the first Tuesday of December, 1830, at the Christian Church, in Milford, New Jersey, at 10 o'clock, A. M. and continue to three o'clock, P.M. and so on, from day to day, until the parties are satisfied.

6. The debate shall be opened by one party in the first morning, and by another the second morning, and so on, from day to day, until the parties are satisfied; so that the closing speech of days and of sessions, shall be alternated with perfect fairness.

7. If one party waives his right to speak, the other may occupy his time; and if one withdraw from the debate, the other may proceed until he is satisfied.

8. Though tradition may be pleaded, the sacred scriptures are to be considered the inspired, and, of course, the infallible standard of truth, from which there is no appeal.

9. *Exparte* publications are to be deprecated; but on this subject the parties are to be left to their discretion, as American freemen should be.

10. When Mr. M'Calla shall refer to the Original scriptures, Mr. Lane shall have the right to call Mr. Simon Clough to his assistance, on that reference, provided that Mr. Clough occupy the time allotted to Mr. Lane, and not that which is reserved to his opponent, by Rule 4th.

W. L. M'CALLA.
WM. LANE.

SUBJECT OF DEBATE:

"*Is the man, Christ Jesus, the Supreme and Eternal God?*"

The affirmative maintained by Rev. W. L. M'Calla; and the negative supported by Elder Wm. Lane.

FIRST DAY.

On Tuesday, Dec. 7th, agreeably to the arrangements made by the parties, Mr. M'Calla opened the discussion by making several observations on the doctrine concerning Regeneration, or the New Birth of the Sinner, which he represented as an important change, which none but the eternal God can effect. He proceeded to show that this change is produced in the mind of the sinner by Jesus Christ, and hence inferred that he must be the supreme and eternal God. This was all that he offered, under the appearance of an argument, in his first discourse.

Previous to his making any direct attack on the doctrine of his opponent, he read from Watts, a part of the hymn commencing thus:

> I'm not ashamed to own my Lord,
> Or to defend his cause.—

Mr. M'Calla then proceeded to give the congregation a history of the origin and doctrines of the people called Christians. He informed his audience that he and his opponent professed two different religions; that the

Christians originated from Mr. Stone, and some other Presbyterian ministers, in Kentucky, who were excommunicated from the Presbyterian connexion because they embraced the opinions of an old man who came from Virginia, and denied *the influence of the Holy Spirit, the New Birth, the Atonement, and the Trinity.* He then observed that though the doctrines of the Trinity had been regarded as a mystery, this was no objection in the minds of the first Christians, for Christians of the *Antioch order* had always considered a belief in the doctrine of the Trinity, as essential to Christianity ; and that the piety of any man may be suspected when he denies the old-fashioned doctrine of the Trinity.

Mr. M'Calla then proceeded to declaim concerning Unitarians in general. He said Dr. Priestley considered Unitarianism to consist rather in not believing the commonly received doctrines, than in the adoption of any Christian creed. He further observed, that when Dr. Priestley was informed that Thomas Jefferson was a Deist, he exclaimed "Well, then, *he cannot be far from us!*" So you see, said Mr. M'Calla, Unitarians do not believe in the doctrines of Christ, and, therefore, cannot be considered as Christians, in the proper sense of the term, but are nearly allied to Mahomedans, Pagans, and Deists.

Having thus delineated the faith and character of the Christians and Unitarians, Mr. M'Calla proceeded to show that there was a material distinction between the object of the Trinitarian and Unitarian, or Christian worship. He assumed that he and his Trinitarian brethren worshipped an immaterial and spiritual God but affirmed that his opponent worshipped a materia God, who was only a great man, and the same as th Jupiter of the heathens. In confirmation of these all gations, he read a portion of a chapter from Kincade "*Bible Doctrine,*" on the personality of the Deity, whi is here inserted for the reflections of the reader, that may judge for himself concerning the truth or force Mr. M'Calla's allegation. This we consider to be cessary, because of Mr. M'Calla's repeated reference the book, and the contemptuous manner in which he

treated the honest opinions of a respectable and aged Minister, who, to say the least, possesses higher claims to the veneration and respect of the public, both for talents and experience, than the man who thus rudely attacks the author of the book entitled "Bible Doctrine."

EXTRACT.

"As all our knowledge of God must be received by revelation, it is important that we should believe of him as he is set forth in the inspired writings.

I think many Christians have been led astray from the simple doctrine of the Bible, relative to the person of God, our heavenly Father. Many have taught, and more have believed, that his person fills all immensity. That is, they believe that the very essence of his being exists as much in one place as it does in another, or that he personally exists in all places at the same time. Hence we frequently hear preachers assert that his centre is every where, and his circumference no where; and that he is as essentially here, and in hell, as he is in the heaven of heavens.

In my view this very much resembles the doctrine of the ancient heathen, who held that matter is self-existent, and that God is the soul of matter. Alexander Pope, who professed to be a Christian, appears to have literally believed this doctrine. He expresses himself thus:

> "All are but parts of one stupendous whole,
> Whose body nature is, and God the soul;
> Spreads through all space, extends through all extent,
> Spreads undivided, operates unspent.
> Warms in the sun, refreshes in the breeze, &c."

If this doctrine be true, God must be the origin, and container of all the evil in the universe. Hell, the Devil, all natural corruption, and moral turpitude, must be incorporated in his person; for all these things are contained in immensity, and if his essence fills all immensity, then they must originate, and be contained in the essence of God. According to this doctrine, there can be nothing in the universe in opposition to God, because every thing that originates, and is contained in God, must be agreeable to him.

This theory confounds the colours of good and evil, removes the land marks between vice and virtue, divests God of his agency as Governor of the universe, and makes him to be that very universe itself, governed by the laws of matter. It confounds the colours of good and evil by ascribing to them the same origin, and a common habitation. It is a scriptural fact, that if they both proceed from the same fountain, they cannot be contrary to each other; because a good tree cannot bear evil fruit, nor can a fountain at the same place send forth bitter water and sweet. Every one must acknowledge that as soon as good and evil are blended together, the distinction between vice and virtue is removed.

This doctrine deprives God of his agency, for if his essence fills immensity, he cannot be an active being, because there could be no room for him to act in, unless he could act beyond immensity, which is impossible. He cannot even turn round unless there is some space outside of him, and if there is, he does not fill immensity. It will not do to say that God will move, or turn infinite space, because space is not *Being*, and therefore cannot be turned, nor moved, besides there could be no space to turn it in, nor move it to. We can imagine no space beyond immensity.

If his essence fills all boundless space, he cannot act, nor operate, without acting or operating on himself, because, let him strike or operate into whatsoever part of immensity he might, he would strike or operate on himself. Boundless space cannot move from place to place. Therefore, if he fills all immensity, he cannot have the power of locomotion, unless he contracts and dilates his person, and if he does, he is *changeable in his essence.*

Acting on himself would not be governing the world, unless the world is himself. If the world is God, or a part of God, he is very frail, very changeable, and very much under the control of man.

The Bible represents God as a real person. It holds him out as the Monarch of the universe, and ascribes to him nearly all the members of the human body. The Lord said to Moses, "I will put thee in a cleft of the rock; and will cover thee with my hand while I pa

by: and I will take away my hand, and thou shalt see my back parts: but my face shall not be seen." Exod. xxxiii. 22, 23. If God's person fills all boundless space, how could he pass by Moses? Or how could Moses see his back parts? Did Moses stand outside of infinite space? If God's person fills immensity, there cannot be room in space for Christ to stand at his right hand.

If God's person fills all immensity how could he gather all nations before him? They would all be in him. Christ says, "I proceeded and came forth from God. John, viii. 42. He says, "I came forth from the Father, and am come into the world: again I leave the world, and go to the Father." John, xvi. 28. If God's person is as much in one place as another, how could Christ proceed forth and come from him? If the Father was as much in the place where Christ then stood as he was in any part of the universe, why was it necessary for him to leave the world, in order to go to the Father? If God's person is in every place at the same time, Christ could not come forth from him without leaving all infinite space, and that he could not do without going out of existence.

This text must not be understood in a moral sense, because to go from God in a moral sense, is to become wicked, which cannot be true of Jesus; he never was wicked. Paul says, "Whilst we are at home in the body, we are absent from the Lord: we are confident, I say, and willing rather to be absent from the body, and present with the Lord. Wherefore we labour that whether present or absent, we may be accepted of him." 2 Cor. v. 6, 8, 9. If God's person is every where at once, how can a Christian be absent from him? If Paul alluded to Christ, it affects not the argument, for he is at the right hand of God. To be morally absent from God, is to be alienated from him in the spirit of our minds; of course, Paul should not be understood in that sense, because he could not be in a strait to know whether that, or the presence of God was the better. Besides, he says, "we labour that whether present or absent we may be accepted of him." And he could not expect to be accepted of God while he was absent from him in a moral point of view.

That God is a real person, appears from the following beautiful passage in Daniel: "I beheld till the thrones were cast down, and the Ancient of days did sit, whose garment was white as snow, and the hair of his head like the pure wool; his throne was like the fiery flame, and his wheels as burning fire. A fiery stream issued and came forth from before him: thousand thousands ministered unto him, and ten thousand times ten thousand stood before him; the judgment was set, and the books were opened." "I saw in the night visions, and behold one like the Son of man came with the clouds of heaven, and came to the Ancient of days, and they brought him near before him. And there was given him dominion, and glory, and a kingdom, that all people, nations, and languages should serve him, his dominion is an everlasting dominion, which shall not pass away, and his kingdom that which shall not be destroyed." Dan. vii. 9, 10, 13, 14. If God's personal essence fills all boundless space, this passage must be false. How could boundless space be clothed? or sit on a throne? or ride on wheels? how could a fiery stream issue and come forth from before boundless space? or how could Jesus Christ come to, or be brought near before boundless space? Surely the clothes, the throne, the wheels, the fiery stream, the multitude, and Jesus Christ, must all be in space; then if God fills all space, how could they be around him? under him? come forth from before him? stand before him? or be brought near before him?

Gabriel explains the four beasts, the ten horns, and the little horn in this vision as an allegorical representation of the four great empires that should rule the world, and the antichristian power that should make war against the saints. As all these, and the Son of man, and the great multitude that stood before the Ancient of days, have shape and local habitations, and as shape and locality are as much ascribed to him as they are to them, by what analogy are we to conclude that he has no shape, nor local habitation?

If God's person fills all space, he can have no shape, because shape always implies superficies, and that which is unbounded, has no surface. Whatever is too subtle

to have any shape, must be quality, and a quality, or attribute, has no existence separate from the being that possesses it, therefore, if God is nothing but a quality, he cannot be an agent, nor an intelligent being; hence the conclusion is irresistible, that if he has no shape, he has no real existence, because the being that exists in *no shape*, exists not at all.

The Presbyterian confession of faith says, "God is without body, parts, or passions." In my view this is equal to Atheism; because if we divest him of these, there is nothing left that would constitute being, or that would be perceptible to the mind.

Ears, hands, and eyes are parts of an intelligent ruler, and if God has none of these, he cannot hear, handle, nor see us. If he is without passions, he has no mercy, love, nor anger, and therefore cannot forgive us, love us, nor be angry with us, because if he has not these passions, he cannot exercise them. If it were possible for the divine Being to exist without body, parts, or passions, he would be to us neithor desirable, dreadful, nor useful.

It is only from the Bible that we learn the existence of God, and that book ascribes to him nearly all the members of the human body, and represents him to be in the shape of a man. That various members of the human body are ascribed to him, appears from the following texts. "The eyes of the Lord are upon the righteous, and his ears are open unto their cry. The face of the Lord is against them that do evil." Psal. xxxiv. 15, 16. "He shall gather the lambs with his arm, and carry them in his bosom." Isa. xl. 11. "I will turn my hand upon thee." Isa. i. 25. "The Lord is a man of war, the Lord is his name." Exod. xv. 3. "And God said let us make man in our image, after our likeness." "So God created man in his own image, in the image of God created he him." Gen. i. 26, 27.

Some suppose that being created in the image of God, only means that man was made holy; but I think we should not restrict the word to the quality, it certainly extends to the personal appearance of the man; because in scripture the words *image* and *likeness*, are most gene-

rally used to represent the bodily appearance. Thus in the fourth commandment we read, "Thou shalt not make unto thee any graven image, or any likeness that is in heaven above, or that is in the earth beneath, or that is in the water under the earth." Exod. xx. 4. Here the words *image* and *likeness* are used to represent the appearance of any thing in the heavens above, or on the earth beneath, or in the waters under the earth. The Jews did not understand the words *image* and *likeness* to mean moral perfections, they could not think that their God forbid them to copy the moral perfections of birds, beasts, or fishes, but they well knew, that when they made gold into the shape of a calf, they broke his commandment. That the image of God, in which man was *made*, respects the shape of his person, is evident from his being made of the dust of the ground; because if he was *made* of the *dust* of the ground, and at the same time *made* in the *image* of God, that *image* must consist in the modification, or fashioning of that dust. That this image of God in which man was created, signifies the configuration of his person, is still more evident from this consideration, that he possessed it before he was endowed with any moral perfections, or the breath of life was breathed into his nostrils; which appears from the following text: "And the Lord God formed man of the dust of the ground, and breathed into his nostrils the breath of life; and man became a living soul." Gen. ii. 7. James, speaking of the tongue, says, "Therewith bless we God, even the Father; and therewith curse we men, which are made in the similitude of God." Jam. iii. 9. The apostle here says not that men *were*, but that they *are* made after the similitude of God. This most probably respects their personal appearance, because their minds, in their present fallen state, are not similar to God.

Paul intimates that a man bears that resemblance to God, which a woman does to a man; hence he says, "For a man indeed ought not to cover his head, for as much as he is the image and glory of God, but the woman is the glory of the man." 1 Cor. xi. 7. As Paul speaks of *man* in general, and that in his present fallen

state, he must mean that he has the image of God in the shape of his person, because in a moral point of view, man is not in that divine image. Besides he must mean, that *man* is the image and glory of God, in the same sense that the woman is the glory of the man, and all will acknowledge that to be her person.

There is no truth in scripture more plainly declared, than that Jesus Christ in his pre-existent state, and in his states of humiliation and exaltation, has always been in the shape of a man. Paul says, he is the brightness of his Father's glory, and the express image of his person [Greek *hupostaseos*, substance.] This text shows beyond doubt, that God's person, or substance, is in the shape of a man. It does not say, that he was the image of God's moral perfections, but it says he was the *express image of his person.* Heb. i. 3. Paul to the Collossians, says of Christ, that he is the image of the invisible God. Col. i. 15. God's moral perfections have been revealed, and are visible to every believer, therefore, it must be his person that is called the *invisible God*, then Jesus Christ is the *image* or *shape* of that person.

Paul says: "Let this mind be in you, which was also in Christ Jesus: Who being in the form of God, thought it not robbery to be equal with God." Philip. ii. 5, 6. *Form* is distinct from quality, and always relates to arrangement or shape. This shows that Christ was in the form or shape of God, before he emptied himself of that glory he had with the Father, in his pre-existent state. And we all know that in his early appearances to the patriarchs and prophets, he appeared in the shape of a man, and was frequently called a man. If he was in the form of God, and that form was the shape of a man, then God is in the shape of a man. It is not probable that by taking on him the form of a servant, Christ materially changed the shape of his person; the more probable meaning is, that he emptied himself of his lustre and glory, and was changed from the condition of a great king to that of a servant. When Mark says of Christ, that he appeared in another *form* unto two of his disciples, he does not mean that the Saviour appeared in the

shape of some being entirely different from a man, but that he was so changed in his external appearance that they did not know him. If the word *form* means moral perfections, then it follows that he emptied himself of God's moral perfections, and took on himself the form, that is, the moral perfections of a servant. Whether the form of God that he had before he took the form of a servant, was the shape of man or not, it was the form or shape of God, therefore it remains a fact that God has a shape."

Mr. Lane replied, by observing, that what Dr. Priestley and Mr. Kinkade had said and written, could have no application to the object of the present debate; for though all Mr. Kinkade had written were erroneous, though Dr. Priestley and Thomas Jefferson were infidels, and the people called Christians altogether as bad as his opponent could represent them, the admission of all these charges would not establish either the positive or negative of the doctrinal proposition which they had assembled to investigate. He avowed his desire to stand or fall alone, without being implicated in the faith or infidelity of any man; and therefore he did not consider the character of the connexion to which he belonged, as in any degree exposed to jeopardy, by the sayings or doings of a single member, for as such he had undertaken this discussion.

After complaining that his opponent had spent so much time without adducing any argument to sustain the position which he had assumed, he would not delay to recriminate, but endeavour to call attention to the subject of discussion. He acknowledged his belief, that *Jesus is a divine person*, but expressly denied that *he is the supreme and eternal God*. Declaring his conviction that the testimony of scripture was in accordance with his views on this subject, he consequently expressed his willingness to meet the Goliath of the Presbyterians!

Mr. Lane then explicitly avowed his opinions concerning the person of Christ, and opened an ample field for the trial of all the abilities and prowess of his oppo-

nent, by laying down and proving from the scriptures, the following propositions:

1. Whoever Christ was, he had a Father, which the eternal God could not have.

2. This Father of Jesus is the only true God.

3. This true God consists of only one person, and not of different persons.

To establish the first proposition, he alleged the testimony of God from heaven, both at the baptism and transfiguration of Christ, declaring him to be his *well beloved Son;* likewise the testimony of Peter: Thou art the Son of the living God; which was approved by our Lord as a divinely revealed truth; and also the fact, that in no instance did ever Christ assume or claim a higher rank than that of the Son of God; in which character and capacity he performed all the mighty works ascribed to him by the sacred writers.

In support of the second proposition, he adduced the solemn prayer of Christ, recorded in the seventeenth chapter of John, and addressed to his heavenly Father; in which he calls the *Father* the *only true God* exclusively: also the testimony of the apostle Paul, who informs the Corinthians, that though there be many who are called gods in earth and in heaven, yet to Christians there is but *one God*, the *Father*. Here he pressed his opponent with several pungent interrogatories, such as, Has the eternal God a Father? Will my opponent contradict Jesus, by saying the Father is not the only true God? Or, will he affirm, that Paul was mistaken, when he called the Father the *one*, or *only* God? Are there two other persons, besides this one God, each of whom is as truly God, as the Father?

To confirm the third proposition, that the *supreme* and *true God* subsists in only one person, Mr. Lane referred to those passages of scripture in which the singular pronouns are applied to the great eternal Being, who is pronounced the God *supremely* and *exclusively*, and also to those passages where the word *person*, applied to the Deity, is used in the singular number. Such are the following: Jehovah is God; there is none *other* besides *him*, Deut. iv. 35. Besides *me* there is no God, Isa. xliv.

6. The express image of *his person*, Heb. i. 3. Will ye accept *his person*, Job, xiii. 8. Here Mr. Lane observed, that in these passages of scripture, the person of the supreme and eternal God, was expressly declared to be singular and uncompounded; and hence the doctrine of his opponent could be true, on no other condition, than by supposing *three* persons in *one* person, or *three* Gods in *one* God.

Mr. M'Calla began his second address by complaining of being represented as Goliath, and appealed to the congregation to judge between him and his opponent, which was most entitled to the appellation. Then reading the challenge signed by Mr. Lane, and addressed to *any man belonging to the great leading sects in our country*, he observed that Mr. Lane had, in this instance, proceeded just as Mr. Kneeland had done on a former occasion. After vapouring through the country, and bantering all men for months, and even defying the servants of the Living God, as soon as he had appeared as an humble servant of the Divine Jesus, to plead his cause, this enemy, like the former, immediately brands him as the challenger, and calls him Goliath!

After this extemporary exordium, Mr. M'Calla resumed his history of the Christians, whom he denominated worshippers of a material God, having form, eyes, ears, hands, and feet; possessing all the passions and vices of the heathen deities, and differing in nothing essential from their Jupiter. This Jupiter, he said, was once a man, but after death, he was deified by the heathen nations, who regarded him as the father of all the gods, and ascribed to him all the vile passions of men. This was the same as the Unitarian's material God, described by Kinkade, Priestley, and Wright, who are all as gross idolaters as the worshippers of Jupiter.

Mr. M'Calla then proceeded to notice the state of infidelity in Europe, and after a brief description of the Theologians of Germany, and the clergy of the Canton of Geneva, he informed his hearers, that these German divines, the Unitarians of England and America, and

the Christians, were all the same; and that they are all nearly allied to Mahomedans and heathens. He then entertained the congregation by a descant on *Liberal Christianity*, and its effects on the religious world. Pure Christianity, once preached at Geneva, was displaced by the Liberal preachers and Rationalists, who were no better than Deists or Atheists at heart. These are the Christians of Europe, who ridicule the idea of three persons in one person, and three Gods in one God."

He then appealed to the congregation against this representation of the Trinity, and informed them that he believed in three persons in *one being*, and regarded each person as an *intelligent agent*. Hence he did not say there were three persons in one, but three intelligent agents in one being. This he acknowledged to be a divine mystery. In reply to the arguments drawn by Mr. Lane from the divine Sonship against the Supreme Deity of Jesus, he assumed the doctrine of the two natures in Christ, which he acknowledged to be a great and divine mystery, but not without analogy. He conceived a resemblance in the composition of a human being, consisting of soul and body, of whom it might be affirmed that he was both *mortal* and *immortal;* mortal as to the body, immortal as to the soul. Thus, Jesus is God and man, divine and human. In confirmation of this, he alleged that the phrase *Son of God*, as explicitly implied the Godhead of Christ, as the phrase *son of man*, indicated his humanity; and thus the phrases were understood in the days of Christ, and though accused of blasphemy on this account, Christ did not recede from his lofty claims to pacify the incensed Jews. As man, Jesus is inferior to the Father, as God, he is equal to his Father.

Mr. Lane began his reply by relating an anecdote of Anthony Wayne, descriptive of a singular event that happened between Wayne and a body of Indians, about the close of the Revolutionary War. Wayne had penetrated far into the wilderness after the Indians, and when night approached he ordered his men to form a camp,

enclosed by logs and such other materials as the woods afforded, and to kindle a fire in the midst thereof. He then required every one to take a log and bind on it his blanket, and set it up in the inclosure of the camp, that these logs might resemble, in the night season, the figures of men. Having thus completed their stratagem, they withdrew and concealed themselves in the woods. About midnight, they perceived their camp surrounded with Indians, who gathering slowly around the inclosure, discharged a volley of arrows on their supposed enemies: then, with uplifted tomahawks, at the shrill cry of the war-whoop, they rushed on the foe. But anon, Wayne and his men came upon them by surprise, surrounded them, and cut them off to a man!

Thus, said Mr. Lane, my opponent has appeared in all his armory, to carry defeat and desolation into the camp of the German Theologians, and pours a volley of arrows on them, Dr. Priestley, Thomas Jefferson, and others, but he mistakes his aim, for I am not in the camp. What the Theologians of Germany, the Unitarians of England and America, or any other men, Christian or Infidel, have written, has nothing to do with my opinions, nor the subject under discussion. I wish to stand or fall alone.

Mr. Lane then proceeded to give an account of his coming to this country, and the conduct of the clergy towards him, in nearly the following words. About two years ago I came into this country, to visit the land of my ancestors, and preach the gospel to the companions of my father's youth. I was requested, particularly by my father, to preach in the two churches he had formerly attended; the one at Baskonridge, the other at Lamington. This request was made known to the pastors of these churches, who utterly refused the use of their houses; giving as a reason, that I was a dangerous man; and that I was more to be feared than a Mahomedan, and was even worse than a Deist or an Atheist; inasmuch as I came with the Bible in my hand, the more effectually to deceive the people. My friends, many of whom were members of these churches, considered the conduct of these ministers as harsh and abrupt; and re-

solved to hear a doctrine that was so much denounced. Agreeably to the request of my friends, I preached in their neighbourhood, and gave my views of the *unity* of God, and the *proper sonship* of Jesus Christ. My views were generally received, and from this time, effectual doors were opened for me. My congregation increased, much to the annoyance of the self-styled orthodox, who, to suppress my views, spared no pains, in public and in private, to misrepresent my opinions, and warn the people against me. Meetings were appointed to expose my views, some of which I attended. After hearing a long discourse, the burden of which was a misrepresentation of my doctrine, I requested the privilege of answering for myself; but this I could not obtain: I have often begged the privilege of simply stating my views, but even this could not be granted.

Some months ago, a friend of mine was informed, that if I would put my hand to paper, or if I would sign a public challenge, a man should be produced that would meet me. This I declined for some time, until it was reported that I dare not do it. About this time a meeting was holden at Milford, in the Christian chapel, by the professedly orthodox, attended by six ministers of different denominations, for the purpose, as it was believed, of putting down our sentiments. This meeting I unexpectedly attended, and at the close, I gave the public and general challenge, that was afterwards, with some modifications, accepted by the present opponent, Mr. M'Calla. We have met according to the terms proposed and accepted, but instead of attending to the subject, or attempting to answer my arguments, he pursues the too-often adopted, but contemptible and unchristian course, of endeavouring to bring me and my opinions into disrepute by unprincipled slander, and misrepresentation. One of the means by which my opponent wishes to accomplish his end, is by endeavouring to persuade this congregation, that I and Mr. Kinkade are Materialists. But, my friends, he cannot produce any thing from Mr. Kinkade's book, or any other, to prove that any preacher in the Christian connexion is a *Materialist.*

Let us now attend to the subject of debate. The gentleman who has undertaken the affirmative, has, at his own option, voluntarily proposed to maintain that the *man* Christ Jesus, is the supreme God. Does not this look like Materialism? What can be so, if the belief that a *man is God*, amount not to the very doctrine which Mr. M'Calla so strenuously opposes? The God in which he professes to believe, was born of a woman, laid in a manger, suffered, died, and was buried. Thus it is easy to retort on my opponent, that the God whom he acknowledges, is a material being. This might be also shown from the manner in which he divides and subdivides the Deity into a number of intelligent agents, or persons. Indeed, if his doctrine be true, that Jesus is compounded of two distinct beings in one person, three such persons must make six beings. At one time he tells us, God consists of three persons; and at another, he assumes that Jesus is the supreme God, and consists of only one person. This is *Materialism*, and borders on Atheism; for if Christ be supreme God, and each of the other persons be also a supreme God, there must be three supreme Gods; or, in other words, no supreme God at all. Now why am I called an infidel and a materialist, and charged with the worship of a material God, no better than Jupiter? Must not every one perceive, that my opponent is deficient in argument, and unable to approach the discussion of the subject in a pertinent and suitable manner?

But my opponent believes that Jesus Christ, in his divine nature, is the supreme God; and in his human nature, truly and properly a man; and that these two natures are united in one person. With this belief, let us read the fifth verse of the seventeenth chapter of John. *Father, glorify me with thine own self, with the glory I had with thee before the world was.* Now, will my opponent tell the congregation, which of the two natures makes this prayer. If he say the divine, which according to his doctrine is the supreme and eternal God, may we not ask him, to what Father can the supreme God pray? or, how can the eternal God have a Father? If he say the human nature made this address to the su-

preme Deity, then may we not also ask, was the human nature of Christ in heaven before the world was, and some thousands of years before it was conceived by the Virgin Mary?

In resuming the argument, Mr. M'Calla assigned as a reason of his not attending to the evidences adduced by his opponent, that he had not a copy of them on paper, but said if Mr. Lane would give him his arguments on paper, he would answer them.

Whether Mr. M'Calla perceived the inaccuracy of denominating Jesus the supreme God, we cannot say; but he here affirmed his belief that *Father, Son, and Holy Spirit*, constitute the *one supreme* God.

He then proceeded to a farther consideration of the heathen and material God of Unitarians. He said the objects of the Trinitarian and Unitarian worship were wholly dissimilar. He informed the audience that Christians of the Antioch order had always worshipped a scriptural God, but the Christians to which his opponent belonged, were heathens right out. Their God was not better than Nebuchadnezzar's golden image. He denounced the prayer of his opponent as no better than howlings, or the cries of the worshippers of Baal, when they prayed and cut themselves. To pray to the God of the Christians, was of no more avail than to pray to the Virgin Mary, or the Baal, or Jupiter of the heathens. Therefore, he inferred, that no Trinitarian could unite with them in prayer, and none but infidels could associate with them in religious communion.

He read Mr. Kinkade's remarks on three persons in the Deity; again avowed his belief in one supreme God, Father, Son, and Holy Ghost; and observed that Simon Magus was the first who began the opposition to this doctrine, which was now carried on by Infidels and Unitarians.

END OF THE FIRST DAY.

NOTICE TO THE READER.

In the foregoing sketches of the arguments produced by the disputants, we have embraced all that we conceived to be pertinent to the subject, or interesting to the reader, in the first day's discussion. The friend of him who sustained the affirmative, and who made the communication to the *Philadelphian*, which we have inserted in the preface, freely admits that Mr. M'Calla did little more, during the first day, than to draw from Mr. Lane the peculiar doctrines of his system. It cannot therefore be expected, that much should be said by either of the parties, that could have any direct bearing on the proposition selected for discussion. We have consequently abridged the report, so far, as to reject the mere tautologies and recriminations of the different speeches, being persuaded, that frequent repetitions, and irrelevant bickerings, could neither communicate information, nor useful entertainment to our readers, whatever their peculiar opinions may be, relative to the subject of debate.

SECOND DAY.

Mr. Lane commenced, by observing that his opponent seemed to feel much interest in persuading the people to believe, that the God of the Christians was a material God, like Jupiter; but, my friends, said he, I never believed in a material God; and if any of our preachers have ever promulgated such a sentiment, it has been without my knowledge, for I have never heard that any of them has donē so. I believe I have shown that the doctrine of a material Deity belongs much more properly to my opponent, than to me, or any of my friends. For myself I can truly say that I believe in one God, the Father Almighty, whom I consider a Spiritual Being, an Infinite Intelligence; and I believe in one Lord Jesus, the Son of this only true God. I cannot, therefore, be called a Materialist. It is somewhat unnecessary to propose arguments when they do not receive attention; but I shall here adduce evidence that will involve the doctrine of three persons in one Being, in that confusion and unintelligibility, from which my opponent will not be able to extricate or deliver it.

The doctrine of the Trinity involves the idea of three co-equal, co-essential, and co-eternal persons in the Godhead. Now these persons must be either finite or infinite. If they are finite, a multiplicity of finite beings will fall as far short of infinity, as a multitude of miles will fail of measuring infinite space. That they are all infinite, *cannot be true;* for if the first person in the Trinity be infinite, he can comprehend the second and third persons. If the second and third persons can be comprehended, they are not infinite. If the first person cannot comprehend the second and third persons, he is not infinite; for there are at least two beings whom he cannot comprehend.

Again, the doctrine of the Trinity, involving the idea of three equal persons in the Godhead, brings my opponent into another dilemma; for on this supposition, nei-

ther of the three persons in the Godhead can be almighty. If the first person be almighty, he can compel the second and third persons; but if he cannot compel the second and third persons, he is not almighty; for there are two persons of equal power to himself, whom he cannot control. If the second and third persons can be controlled, they are not almighty, for there is a power superior to theirs, by which they are controlled. All that my opponent's three co-equal persons could do, admitting them to be infinite, is, to meet in the centre of infinite space, and eternally neutralize each other's influence!

"If God be possessed of all possible perfections, in an infinite degree, all other Gods must be useless, or rather, the very supposition of their existence is absurd. Their existence, if possible, might only tend to disturb, pervert, or overturn the order and harmony of the universe.

What more could be necessary for the formation and government of infinite space, filled with worlds, than infinite power and infinite wisdom, universally diffused throughout that infinite space. Can infinite space itself, admit more than one infinite Deity? And can that Deity inclose, in his very nature, any other being, that it is not subordinate and limited, seeing such a one must be entirely under the influence of his control, and shut up in his unbounded grasp? One infinite Jehovah is sufficient; more would be unnecessary; they cannot exist; infinite space could not contain them."

Mr. M'Calla then addressed the congregation to the following effect:—My opponent has been entertaining you with a discourse about infinity and infinite persons. He also undertakes to speak of philosophy, and yet he knows nothing about it. I was informed by a friend last night, that this would be his course to-day, and here you have it. But I could have read all this, as well as all the arguments he has yet offered, from Mr. Kinkade's *book.*

My friends, Mr. Kinkade, and my opponent, are not alone in their doctrines. Miss Wright believes the same sentiments; for, I assure you, I have had occasion to notice them. They are all *Rationalists*. They all talk about *matter* and *motion;* cause and effect. Their whole system is no better than the doctrine and worship of Baal. Thank God! we have something better than reason to guide us to Heaven. We have the Bible, the Word of God—and these holy scriptures teach us, that *Jesus is the Mighty God;* God over all; God manifest in the flesh; the true God and Eternal Life. Then turning to the extract which we have inserted from Mr. Kinkade's book, he read the passage which ascribes eyes, ears, and hands to God, and thence inferred that he had not misrepresented Mr. Kinkade, or his opponent, by calling them believers in a material God. Afterwards he appealed to the people, calling upon them to judge, whether the God in whom his opponent believed, was any thing superior or better than a mere man.

On the importance of the union of the divine and human natures in the person of Christ, he descanted for some time, showing the necessity thereof in order to the accomplishment of the atonement; and alleged the impossibility of an infinite atonement, unless made by a being who was infinite. He attempted to prove that the system of his opponent would not admit of an atonement, by reason of the low rank assigned to the Saviour. Thus Mr. M'Calla, assuming the doctrine of an infinite atonement made by Jesus, inferred the infinite dignity of his person, and the literal application of the name of God in its proper and unqualified signification.

Mr. Lane rose, and thus addressed the congregation: So far from proving that "Jesus Christ is the supreme and eternal God," the arguments of my opponent go to prove him only a mere man. Ought he not to remember that the question is, "Is the *man*, the *man* Christ Jesus, the supreme and eternal God?" My opponent agreed to sustain the affirmative, but, now he has spent conside-

rable time to prove, that the man Christ Jesus is nothing but simply a man; and that as man, he was the son of David! My friends, my views of the Son of God are far more exalted; I believe that Jesus Christ is the second man; the Lord from Heaven. My opponent has told us that *Jesus Christ* took *human nature*—that he possessed two whole and distinct natures—the one very God; the other properly man. Although he has not adduced a single passage in support of this doctrine from the Bible. But he tells us, it is not without *analogy;* for man possesses a soul and body—*two* beings in *one* person. Now, my friends, if it require two beings to make one person, and God exists in three persons, then God must be composed of *six beings!* The atonement, of which my opponent talks so much, according to his *own* doctrine, was made by a man—a mere man.

We will now examine 2 Cor. chap. 8, ver. 9. according to my opponent's doctrine of two natures: "Ye know the grace of our Lord Jesus Christ that though he was *rich*, he became *poor*, that we through his poverty might be made rich!!" As a man, we do not see Jesus Christ sinking from riches to poverty. He was born in a stable, and cradled in a manger; and he never sinks below this in all his life. But to the contrary, he finds a tomb among the rich. Will my opponent tell us when the divine nature, (which he says is the supreme God,) became *poor?* or will he admit that the supreme God is unchangeable? According to my views this passage is perfectly plain and intelligible. The Son of God who was rich with his Father before the world was, became poor, that we through his poverty might be rich. Again, when Jesus Christ says, "I came down from Heaven, not to do mine own will, but the will of him that sent me," will my opponent inform us, of which of Christ's two natures he was speaking? If it were of his divine nature, I ask, if the eternal God came down from Heaven to do the will of another? If he speak of his human nature, I would then ask, if that ever was in Heaven?

Mr. M'Calla resumed the defence of the proposition, by relating a humorous anecdote, which occasioned some laughter. He said his opponent's conduct brought to his recollection the instructions he received from an innkeeper, at the Blue Licks in Kentucky, about the time he began to preach: "You are about," said he, "to enter into the world as a public man, and the only way you can succeed, is, when you have least to say, make the most noise." This advice seems to have been followed by my opponent, for, during the last half hour, he has done little else than bellow to you.

My opponent has asked some questions about the two natures of Christ, in which he made the atonement. But we never believed that God could suffer. I have shown that Christ was truly a man, and the passages in which he is called God, do plainly declare that he was God as well as man.

Mr. M'Calla observed that, whilst the Christians of the Antioch order affirm that Jesus Christ is the Supreme and Eternal God, they do not mean that the human nature of Christ is the Supreme and Eternal God. In the human nature, they believe him to be properly a man, but in his divine nature they have always considered him the Supreme God. Thus they are careful to preserve the distinction of the two natures, while they affirm the unity of his person. He who is the great God, is also the man Christ Jesus. They, therefore, believe that the Word, or Son of God, took on him human nature, consisting of both soul and body; and that, by virtue of the union of the two natures, an infinite atonement was made for sin.

In accordance with this view, we find that in the Scriptures, the word *flesh* frequently signifies the *whole man*. Thus *all flesh shall see the salvation of God. Thou has given him power over all flesh.* So when it is said the Word became *flesh*, or that Christ took on him *flesh*, and was the Son of David according to the *flesh*, we must understand by the word flesh, the entire human nature, including both soul and body. In this nature Christ was dependent on the Father, and subordinate to him; but in the divine he was equal to the Father.

My friends, said Mr. M'Calla, according to the opinion of my opponent, Jesus Christ was only an *angel*; but who ever read of *an angel* coming down from heaven to *die* for the salvation of men! Here he read an extract from "*Kinkade's Bible Doctrine*," commencing at the 140th page, which, for the sake of the reader and future reference, we shall here insert:—

EXTRACT.

"REASONS FOR BELIEVING THAT CHRIST IS CALLED AN ANGEL.

" 'Behold I send my messenger, and he shall prepare the way before me: and the Lord, whom ye seek, shall suddenly come to his temple, even the messenger of the covenant, whom ye delight in: behold he shall come, saith the Lord of hosts. But who may abide the day of his coming? and who shall stand when he appeareth? for he is like a refiner's fire, and like fuller's soap. And he shall sit *as* a refiner and purifier of silver. Mal. iii. 1, 2, 3. The Hebrew *Malacha*, which is here rendered messenger, is the Hebrew word that is mostly, if not always translated angel in the Old Testament. Although this prophecy was delivered, perhaps three hundred and ninety-seven years before the coming of Christ, it speaks of him as the Lord whom the Jews sought, and the Angel, or Messenger who delivered to Moses the covenant that God made with them at Horeb, and represents him as the owner of the Jewish temple. This in my opinion establishes the question of his pre-existence beyond dispute. The phraseology of the above passage proves that Christ existed before John the Baptist did. 'Behold I send my messenger, and he shall prepare the way before me.' It appears from the first chapter of Luke, that John the Baptist was born into the world six months before Christ. Now, if Christ never existed till he was born in the flesh, how could he send John the Baptist before him? Can a nonenity send a messenger to prepare the way before it? It will not do to say that Christ talked to John in person, and sent *him to preach* after they were both born, because John

never knew Christ till he baptized him. He says, "I knew him not: but he that sent me to baptize with water, the same said unto me, Upon whom thou shalt see the Spirit descending, and remaining on him, the same is he which baptizeth with the Holy Ghost.' John i. 33.

"Malachi in this prophecy, speaks of two messengers. One was, 'The Lord, whom ye seek, shall suddenly come to his temple, even the messenger of the covenant whom ye delight in,' who was, no doubt, Jesus Christ. And the other was the Messenger, that was sent before him, viz. John the Baptist, as will appear from the following scriptures. 'Behold I will send you Elijah the prophet before the coming of the great and dreadful day of the Lord.' In the following texts, Christ applies both these predictions to the Baptist.—'For this is he of whom it is written, Behold, I send my messenger before thy face, which shall prepare thy way before thee.' Mat. xi, 10, verse 14. 'And if ye will receive it, this is Elias, which was to come.'

"This Angel of the Covenant was to be as a refiner's fire, and a purifier of silver, which character John applies to Christ in these words, "I indeed baptize you with water unto repentance: but he that cometh after me is mightier than I, whose shoes I am not worthy to bear, he shall baptize you with the Holy Ghost and with fire: whose fan is in his hand, and he will thoroughly purge his floor, and gather his wheat into the garner; but he will burn up the chaff with unquenchable fire.' Mat. iii. 11, 12. See Mark i. 2. 'And thou child shalt be called the prophet of the Highest; for thou shalt go before the face of the Lord to prepare his way.' Luke i. 76. Chap. vii. 27. When Malachi called Christ the Messenger, or Angel of the Covenant, he, no doubt, meant the covenant made at Horeb, because he uses the definite article, *the covenant*, showing that it was one well known to the Jews. It is not probable that they could understand him to mean any other covenant than the one made at Horeb, because it was all the one that existed between them and the Lord, and they knew of no other.

"The person of the supreme God has always been invisible to mortal men. The Lord said to Moses, 'Thou canst not see my face; for there shall no man see me and live,' Exod. xxxiii. 20. Paul says he is 'The blessed and only Potentate, the King of Kings, and Lord of Lords; who only hath immortality dwelling in the light which no man can approach unto; whom no man hath seen, nor can see,' 1 Tim. vi. 15, 16. But we find that Abraham, Moses, and many others, saw a person whom they called God. All the way I have to keep these texts from contradicting each other, is to suppose that those which say no man hath seen, nor can see God, allude to the Father, and those which say men have seen him, refer to the Son. I think John the Baptist has explained it in the following text: 'No man hath seen God at any time; the only begotten Son, which is in the bosom of the Father, he hath declared *him*,' John i. 18.

"Abraham did certainly see those three men that called at his tent in the plain of Mamre, washed their feet, and eat with him, on their way to destroy Sodom, yet one of them is called the Lord, and Abraham called him God. When Hagar fled from her mistress, 'the Angel of the Lord found her by a fountain of water.—And the Angel of the Lord said unto her, I will multiply thy seed exceedingly. And she called the name of the Lord that spake unto her, *thou God seest me*,' Gen. xvi. 7, 10, 13. And in Gen. xvii. 20, God said to Abraham, 'And as for Ishmael, I have heard thee; behold I have blessed him; and will make him fruitful, and will multiply him exceedingly.' Hence it appears that the Angel whom Hagar called God, is the same God that spoke to Abraham.

"When Moses led the flock of Jethro to the mountain of God, 'The Angel of the Lord appeared unto him in a flame of fire, out of the midst of a bush.' For obeying this person that appeared to him in the bush, Moses lost his inheritance in the house of Pharaoh, and suffered reproach. But Paul intimates that Moses suffered the reproach of Christ. Moses did not suffer reproach for believing that Christ would be born into the world, but

for believing and obeying that person, who appeared to him in the bush.

"God said to Moses, 'Behold I send an Angel before thee, to keep thee in the way, and to bring thee into the place which I have prepared; beware of him, and obey his voice, provoke him not; for he will not pardon your transgressions, for my name is in him. But if thou shalt indeed obey his voice, and do all that I speak, then I will be an enemy unto thine enemies,' Exod. xxiii. 20, 21, 22. This Angel or Messenger, who took the Jews into Canaan, is frequently called the *Lord*, and *God*; and it is said of him that he spake unto Moses, face to face, as a man speaketh with his friend.'—Exod. xxxiii. 11. Deut. xxxiv. 10.

"This is the Angel of God's presence, of whom Isaiah speaks in the 9th verse of his 63d chapter: 'In all their afflictions he was afflicted, and the Angel of his presence saved them; in his love and in his pity he redeemed them; and he bare them, and carried them all the days of old. But they rebelled and vexed his Holy Spirit; therefore he was turned to their enemy, *and* he fought against them.' Paul intimates that this very person that supported them in the wilderness, and then destroyed them with serpents, for their rebellion, was Christ.—Hence he says: And did all drink the same spiritual drink; for they drank of that spiritual Rock that followed them: and that Rock was Christ." 1. Cor. x. 4, verse 9. 'Neither let us tempt Christ as some of them also tempted, and were destroyed of serpents.'

"That the Lord who made the covenant with Abraham, and brought the Jews out of Egypt, is called an Angel, appears from the following passage: 'And an Angel of the Lord came up from Gilgal to Bochim, and said, I made you to go up out of Egypt, and have brought you into the land which I sware unto your Fathers; and I said I will never break my covenant with you, and ye shall make no league with the inhabitants of this land; ye shall throw down their altars: but ye have not obeyed my voice; why have ye done this?—Wherefore I also said I will not drive them from before you.' Judge ii. 1, 2, 3. When Jacob was blessing Joseph and his sons,

he said: 'The God who fed me all my life long unto this day; the Angel who redeemed me from all evil, bless the lads." Gen. xlviii. 15, 10.

"And Jacob was left alone; and there wrestled a man with him until the breaking of the day: And when he saw that he prevailed not against him, he touched the hollow of his thigh; and the hollow of Jacob's thigh was out of joint as he wrestled with him. And he said, let me go, for the day breaketh. And he said, I will not let thee go except thou bless me. And he said unto him, what is thy name, and he said Jacob.—And he said thy name shall be called no more Jacob, but Israel: for as a Prince, hast thou power with God, and with men, and hast prevailed. And Jacob asked *him*, and said tell me, I pray thee, thy name. And he said, wherefore *is it that* thou dost ask after my name? And he blessed him there. And Jacob called the name of the place Peniel; for I have seen God face to face, and my life is preserved,' Gen. xxxii. 24--30. In metaphorical language it will do to say, that Jacob wrestled with God by prayer; but it will not do to say that God wrestled with Jacob by prayer. There can be no doubt but that Jacob prayed on this occasion to that personage with whom he wrestled, but still there is no doubt but that they wrestled literally.

"Saint Stephen speaks of the Angel that appeared to Moses in the bush, as a person distinct from God; he says: "This Moses, whom they refused, saying, who made thee a ruler and a judge? the same did God send *to be* a ruler and a deliverer by the hands of the Angel, which appeared to him in the bush.' Acts vii. 35. In verse 38, he says, 'This is he that was in the church in the wilderness with the Angel which spake to him in the Mount Sinai, and with our Fathers: who received the lively oracles to give unto us.' And in the 53d verse he tells the Jews that they had received the law by the disposition of Angels, and had not kept it. From the above passage it appears that the Angel who appeared to Moses in the bush, and with whom he spake in the mount, and from whom he received the law, was not the supreme Being, but an Angel sent by God to establish

the covenant with the Jews. And in the third chapter of Malachi, we are informed that the Angel, or Messenger of that covenant, is the Lord, whose forerunner was John the Baptist. And in the third chapter of Matthew, we are explicitly told that this Messenger of the covenant is *Jesus Christ.*

Again, the above evidence proves, that their spiritual guide, who supported them, and against whom they rebelled, was sometimes called God, at other times called an Angel, and sometimes called a man. And Saint Paul tells us, that they drank of that spiritual Rock that followed them, and that Rock was Christ. And that when they rebelled against that person, they tempted Christ.

The title *Michael, the Archangel,* literally signifies *the head messenger that is like God.* This must be Jesus Christ, because we all acknowledge that he is the image of God, and the head messenger that was ever sent into our world.

"I have often heard preachers speaking of Archangels in the plural, but in scripture the word is always mentioned in the singular, with the definite article *the* before it, by which one particular personage is denoted. In fact, there can be but one Archangel, that is, one *head messenger*, and who dare to say that Jesus Christ is not the *head messenger ?*

"If Christ is a *messenger*, he is an *Angel.* If he is the *head messenger*, he is the *Archangel.* If he is *like* God, he is *Michael ;* therefore he must be *Michael, the Archangel.* I think every candid person that knows the meaning of these words will agree with me on this point.

Jude says, "Michael the Archangel, when contending with the devil, he disputed about the body of Moses, durst not bring against him a railing accusation, but said, the Lord rebuke thee.' Jude ix. Now, if the Lord buried the body of Moses, and if Michael the Archangel took care of the body of Moses, then the titles *Lord,* and *Michael the Archangel,* are only different titles or names given to the same person.

"I am not alone in this opinion ; most of the principal writers of the Trinitarian school have advocated the

same doctrine. Brown's Dictionary of the Bible on the words *Michael* and *Angel*, says, that both these words do sometimes refer to Christ; and also affirms that Christ is the Archangel. Wood's Scriptural Dictionary teaches nearly, if not exactly, the same on this subject that Brown's does. Buck, in his Theological Dictionary, under the article *Angel*, asserts that Christ is in scripture frequently called an Angel. Butterworth, Cruden, and Taylor, in their Concordances, assert that *Michael* and *Angel* are both names of Christ.

"Little did many of these great and good men think that when they were teaching that Christ is an Angel, that he is the Angel of the covenant, the Angel of God's presence, and Michael the Archangel, they were thereby undermining Trinitarianism; yet they actually were, because, if he was the Angel of God, and as Moses says, the Angel that God sent to bring the Jews out of Egypt, he cannot be God in the highest sense of the word.

"The drift of the writer in the first chapter of Hebrews, was not to show that Christ was no messenger, but to show that he was made greater than all the messengers of God; therefore, when the above text is brought to prove that Christ never was an Angel, that is, a messenger of God, it is pressed into a service for which it was never designed by the writer."

Mr. Lane then arose, and replied in the following manner:—My opponent has referred to Isa. ix. 6. in proof of the supreme deity of Jesus. The passage reads, "Unto us a child is born, unto us a Son is given; the government shall be upon his shoulders, his name shall be called Wonderful, Counsellor, the Mighty God, the Everlasting Father, the Prince of Peace." On this passage he lays much stress; but before we admit this, as proof incontrovertible of the supreme deity of our Lord Jesus Christ, we will examine it, and make some inquiries, to which my opponent will perhaps deign to reply.

1. This person whoever he was, was a *child born.*

Now, does my opponent believe, that the supreme God

was ever a *child born?* If so, who was his Father? Can a child be his own father?

2. This person was a *son given.*

Does my opponent believe that the supreme God was ever a Son given? If so, of whom was he, the Son, and who possessed the supreme and eternal God, so as to have the right to dispose of him as a gift?

3. It is here predicted by the prophet, that *the government shall be upon his shoulders.*

This presupposes that the government had not before been upon his shoulders. Now does my opponent believe, that there ever was a time when the government was not upon the shoulders of the supreme and eternal God? Was not his government delegated? and could the eternal God require a delegated power?

4. *His name shall be called, &c.*

It does not say, he was always *Wonderful, Counsellor, the Mighty God.* Can these titles prove any thing? On the contrary, we contend, that they can no more prove Jesus Christ to be the supreme and eternal God, than the names *Lion, Lamb, Rock, Vine, Root,* or *Star,* prove him to be a Lion, Lamb, or Root. We admit that the Father hath highly exalted the Son, and "given him a name which is above every name." But we read that, "the Lord said to Moses, See, I have made thee a *God* to Pharaoh." Besides, in numerous passages in the Old and New Testaments, the name God is given to *rulers, kings,* and *mighty conquerors.* Now, God has given to Christ a name above every name, because he is the *proper Son* of the *invisible God.* He, therefore, inherits his name from his Father. Whatever Jesus Christ is, he derived his existence, and all that he has, from his Father.

5. This same person, who is called the mighty God, is to sit on the throne of his Father David, to order and establish it. Here again I ask, does my opponent believe, that David was the Father of the supreme and eternal God?

6. *The zeal of the Lord of hosts shall perform this.*

The Lord of hosts was the Father of this child; Jehovah gave this Son, and "set him on his holy hill of

Zion;" he gave him his names—he placed the government on his shoulders. Therefore, in all this, the Son was subject and inferior to the Lord of hosts, his heavenly Father.

Here Mr. Lane read from THOMPSON'S GOSPEL HISTORY, the following extract:

"The Divine Unity, is a doctrine written, as with sundeams, on the ethereal heavens, inscribed on the shining stars, and revolving planets; and is alike the conclusion of the philosopher, and the opinion of the peasant. Nothing but the basest superstition could ever have effaced this sentiment from the human mind. Being an eternal truth founded on the nature and reason of things, it must ever be the deduction of unperverted midns.

This doctrine is equally supported by the testimony of scripture. Open the book of the law, what saith it? I, Jehovah, am your God. Thou shalt have no other. Consult the prophets. Jevovah by them declares there is no other God: I know not any. Hear Jesus himself. Thou shalt worship the Lord thy God; Him only shalt thou serve. This is eternal life, to know thee, the only true God. Ask the apostles. They also tell you, there is but one God, even the Father. In one word, from the first communication of the Deity, till the whole volume of revelation was sealed, the uniform language of Gods' messengers has been, Jehovah the Creator of the universe, is ONE; there is no other God but HE."

The following criticism on those texts in which Jesus is called God, according to the opinion of Mr. M'Calla, is taken from THOMPSON'S SYSTEMATICAL THEOLOGY.

"Isa. xi. 6, is frequently adduced as a proof that Jesus is called the mighty God. But the Hebrew text might have been translated, *The mighty God shall call him a Wonderful Mediator, Father of his Age, and the Prince of Peace.* The Greek scholar will do well to consult the Vatican Septuagint, where the word God, is wanting. It is also left out in *Luther's* Bible. If this reading be correct, all the controversy about the application of the term *God*, to Jesus, is for ever set at rest. I believe it impossible to produce a text from the Bible, where Jesus is called God absolutely."

"Rom. ix. 5.—*God over all.* Trinitarians imagine that this is an appellation of Christ, but with what authority will soon appear. The punctuation of this verse has occasioned much controversy and obscurity. Every able commentator, however, knows that the *original copies were not pointed at all.* Michaelis justly observes, "many obscurities have been occasioned by a false method of punctuation, and every commentator should remedy this by occasional alteration, and not servilely to adhere to the present arrangement." These things being admitted, the fourth and fifth verses form a grand climax, and should be read thus: Israelites to whom belong, the adoption, the glory, the covenants, the law, the service, the promise, the fathers, the Christ according to the flesh, the God over all, blessed be his name, for ever. Amen.

In this translation I have followed Harwood, Whitby, and Slichtingius, names that will always be dear to the church of God and sacred literature. Many of the ancient fathers strictly denied that Christ was God over all, as the common reading in our translation would suggest, which shows that they did not read the passage with the same punctuation or construction found in the English Testament. From Waterland's Vindication, it is abundantly manifest, that Dionysius, Justin, Theophilus, Athenagoras, Tatian, Tertullian, and Hippolytus, all asserted that there was a time in which the Son was produced by the Father; consequently they never imagined him to be *God over all.* Moreover, Athanasius himself, contra Sabel: affirms "that Jesus is not the Father, nor as the Sabellians say, the only God, all the holy scriptures testify. And again, contra Gentes, he says, 'he who is the true God, is the Father of Christ.'

1 John v. 20. 'To paraphrase this passage of true religion, says Dr. Doddrige, is quite enervating the force of scripture; and taking a liberty with plain words by no means to be allowed. It is an argument for the Deity of Christ, which almost all who have written in its defence, have urged: and which, I think, none who have opposed it, have ever appeared to answer.' The whole strength of the Dr.'s argument consists in referring the

pronoun, *this*, to Christ, the nearest antecedent. Let us apply his reasoning to a similar case, 2 John 7. *Many deceivers are entered into the world, who confess not that Jesus the Christ is come in the flesh. This is a deceiver and antichrist.* Now according to Doddridge's mode of reasoning, to refer the singular pronoun, *this*, to the remote and plural antecedent, deceivers, 'is taking a liberty with plain words, by no means to be allowed.' By the rule adopted in the reasoning of the Dr. and others, whereby they would prove that Jesus is the true God, they can prove him to be a deceiver and antichrist; which, indeed, he must have been, had he pretended to be what they erroneously call him. In both places, the pronoun, *outos, this*, which usually belongs to the proximate, must be preferred to the remote antecedent the deceiver, and antichrist is he who confesses not that Jesus is come in the flesh, or that he was a real man. The true God is that being, the knowledge of whom Jesus taught his disciples.

'Some moderns,' says Dr. Clarke, 'refer the pronoun, *this*, to Christ, who is mentioned immediately before; but others, with all the ancients, and more agreeably to John's style, John xvii. 3, understand it of God the Father, who is also mentioned a little before. The construction is not difficult. *We know that the Son of God is come, and has given us understanding, that we may know him that is true*, ton alethinon Theon, the true God: (So the most and best MSS. have it, in like manner as John xvii. 3.) *and we are in him that is true*, i. e. the true God; for the construction of the words manifestly require them to be understood of the same person; by, or through, *his son Jesus Christ*, (agreeably to the Bishop's Bible in the time of Henry the Eighth.) *This is the true God and eternal life.* No writer, before the time of the council of Nice, interprets the words, *this is the true God*, concerning Christ; and how they were understood in the following age, appears from the manner in which Epiphanes argues: 'Christ,' says he, 'ought to be acknowledged the true God, though not so called by St. John.' Dr Whitby adopts this manner of explaining this passage, and says, 'thus the disciple well accords with his

Master, and only teaches what he had learned of him.' John xvii. 3."

Mr. M'Calla then proceeded to establish the affirmative of the proposition, by arguments drawn from the titles given to Christ.

1. The name *Lord*. This title he endeavoured to prove, belonged, in its proper application, to the one Jehovah, the supreme and eternal God. Thus Isaiah represents Jehovah as saying "I am the *Lord*, this is my name, and my glory, that is my glorious name, I will not give to another." Notwithstanding, Paul informs us that Christ is the Lord from heaven, and that he who was crucified by the Jews, was the Lord of Glory.

Here Mr. M'Calla read Exodus, third chapter, to the 18th verse, where the Angel is called Lord God; and observed, that Mr. Kinkade admitted that this applied to Jesus Christ, but supposes that he was only an exalted God. This Mr. M'Calla considered as tending to idolatry and blasphemy.

2nd. The title *God*, which he thought to be ascribed to Christ in the most unqualified sense, in those passages where Christ is called the mighty God, God over all, the great God, the true God, and God manifest in flesh. These names, and the passages in which they occur, he considered sufficient proof that Jesus is the supreme God, as certainly as the passages which he had formerly adduced, do prove him to be a man.

To establish the doctrine of the two natures in Christ, he cited the Evangelist Luke, to testify that Christ was both the Lord and Son of David; and also the testimony of the Evangelist John, that Jesus is both the root and offspring of David. Moreover, having alleged a number of passages to prove that the term *flesh* is often synonymous with *man*. He thence inferred, that as Christ is called by the Apostle the Son of David, according to the *flesh*, he must have been truly *man*. Thus Mr. M'Calla endeavoured to demonstrate the two natures of Christ, from the appellations Son of Man, or Son of David, and

Son of God, or Lord, and root of David. In corroboration of the argument in favour of Christ's Supreme Deity, he also referred to the titles of Christ, and assumed the infinity of his power, from his capacity of doing whatever the Father has done.

In Isa. ix. 6, Jesus is called the mighty God, but my opponent will tell you this text is false. I will sustain it by another that undoubtedly refers to Jesus Christ, where he is called the Great God. It occurs in Titus ii. 13—"Looking for that blessed hope, and the glorious appearance of the Great God and our Saviour Jesus Christ." With a small alteration supported by high authority, this passage reads: "The Great God, and Saviour of us, Jesus Christ." Now Jehovah says, by Iasiah, I am God, besides me there is no Saviour; but here the apostle says, the Great God and Saviour is Jesus Christ! Moreover, we find that Jesus is called the Lord of hosts. Compare Isa. vi. 5. and John xii. 41. Indeed, we find him in the Old Testament described as the God of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, and the God of Israel.

Mr. Lane commenced by proposing the following questions:—

1. Was the man Christ Jesus born?
2. Did the man Christ Jesus suffer?
3. Did the man Christ Jesus die?
4. Was the man Christ Jesus raised from the dead?

Now, according to the proposition under debate, my opponent maintains that the *man* Christ Jesus is the supreme and eternal God. If this be the fact, the supreme and eternal God was actually born, was dead and buried, and raised from the dead! Who governed the world while the supreme and eternal God was dead, and laid in Joseph's new tomb? and who raised him from the dead? Does not the doctrine of my opponent involve these absurdities? The passage in Exodus iii. 1—18, cannot refer to the supreme and eternal God, for the person there described, is plainly called the angel of the Lord. But the term *angel*, means a messenger. Now

whose angel is the supreme and eternal God? By what means shall we understand the gentleman? At one time he tells us that God is invisible. At the very next instant, he says, the supreme God was a man seen of Abraham, and the patriarchs. That he was dead, and not dead; that he is both the supreme God, and also a son. This reminds me of the story of *Ashdod*, recorded in the last chapter of Nehemiah.

Prior to the Babylonish captivity, the Jews spake the unadulterated Hebrew language. But after they were taken captive by Nebuchadnezzar, and carried away into Babylon, they mingled with the nations whither they went, and married wives of Ashdod, Moab, and Amnon. Hence it happened that when they were brought back to Jerusalem, at the expiration of the 70 years captivity, the prophet Nehemiah, under whose direction the city was rebuilt, soon perceived the corruption of language among his brethren, as a fruit of their intermarriage with the nations around them. Hence their *children* could not *talk plain*, for they spake half Hebrew and half Ashdod.

This story I have used as an illustration of the departure of the true church from apostolic truth and simplicity. The first Christians uniformly spoke of one God, and of Jesus Christ his Son, and of redemption by Jesus Christ as the apostles had taught. But, my friends, this simplicity of doctrine, and purity of language, did not long remain in the church. Ere many centuries had elapsed, the Christians too, like the Jews, were carried away captive; not by Nebuchadnezzar, king of Babylon, but by the influence and seduction of her who holds in her hand a golden cup, full of the wine of her fornications; and has on her forehead a name written, *Mystery, Babylon the Great.*

This Christian captivity commenced a little prior to the reign of the emperor Constantine, but was greatly increased soon afterwards, when the demon of sectarianism and infallibility of judgment, took the reins of church government, and exercised entire dominion over all that could be brought under their power. While death by fire, fagot, sword, halter, and gibbet, in ten thousand

instances, marked the footsteps of these fiery defenders of the faith. Thus a self-styled orthodoxy succeeded, until the church became sunk into the lowest depths of moral turpitude; in which she remained, until the reformation commenced under Luther, and his pious co-adjutors. But no sooner had they lifted up the standard of the cross against the papal corruption and fraud of priestcraft, than the cry of heresy was reiterated against them, followed by sword, fire, and death. This is the same spirit that my opponent, and his self-styled orthodox brethren, manifest toward me and my brethren. They do not indeed pursue us with instruments of death, for a very good reason, *the excellent constitution* of our free country, secures to us the right of thinking for ourselves. But whether they would not resort to ancien expedients, if they possessed the power, is another question.

The pious reformers of the sixteenth century, succeeded in part to redeem the church from that state of moral darkness, and external captivity; but, alas! for us, their children have not learned to talk plain. You see, my friends, my opponent labours under this impediment of speech, he cannot talk plain!! He tells us about *three co-equal, co-essential, and co-eternal persons in the Godhead; about trinity, triune God, God-man, three-one-God, a two-natured Christ, eternal Son, eternal generation*, all of which is in the language of Ashdod. Not one of these expressions can be found in God Almighty's book.

I will conclude at present, by asking two questions, which my opponent can answer when he arises. Is there any other God than he who dwelt in Christ? or is there any other Christ than he in whom God dwelt?

END OF THE SECOND DAY.

THIRD DAY.

Mr. M'Calla rose, and thus resumed the argument :—My opponent has amused you with the story of Ashdod. Yes, my opponent is the only one that can speak the *pure Hebrew;* but you recollect my friends, that I condescended to take the *received translation* of the scriptures, because he knew nothing about the *original.* Now he comes forward and tells us we all speak the corrupt language of Ashdod, and he only speaks the pure Hebrew! But this is the way of all the *Rationalists.* They are the only persons under Heaven who understand the pure languages! But see, my friends, what this leads to. The boasting *Rationalists*—the *Christians* of Germany, while they profess to hold to the *letter* of the Scriptures, have departed into *base infidelity!* But they talk just like my opponent and Miss Wright. "You have a strange God, say they, *one brought* up with *another*, just as two boys are brought up, and go to school together." Thus my opponent blasphemously turns the Bible into ridicule! This is the abominable blasphemy of Thomas Paine! But, blasphemous as this language is, my friends, this is the common language of the *Christians.*

My opponent says the doctrine of the Trinity has been maintained by fire and death; but how different is the fact. The doctrine of the Trinity has always been opposed by heretics, and Trinitarians have often suffered, even unto death, by the hands of their enemies. The first opposition to the doctrine of the Trinity was commenced by Simon *Magus*, whom Mr. Kinkade admits to have been a Christian. In which persecution hundreds of them were put to death, and multitudes cast into prison, where their situation resembled that of Jeremiah in Jerusalem. But these Christians, *poor innocent creatures*, they *tell us they have always been opposed by the Orthodox.*

Mr. M'Calla continued his vituperation, and said it was necessary, to be a Christian of the Antioch order, to

believe in the miraculous conception, and in the resurrection of our Saviour; but this is not necessary to become a Unitarian Christian; these things are treated by the *Christians* as fables or legends. It is not necessary, according to their doctrine, to feel a sorrow for sin, or even to experience a change of heart. If they neither murder, nor steal horses, they are accounted good members of society. Yes, my friends, any but *murderers* and horse thieves, are good *Christians*, and freely admitted to their communion.

If there be any thing in the sacred Scriptures which, according to their judgment, is unreasonable, they account for it in this way: "The Historians were men of like passions with other men, they sometimes drank too much, and they probably wrote these things before they got sober!"

The account of Christ and Peter walking on the water, say the German *Theologians*, is not to be understood literally! They suppose it is probable, that when Peter saw Jesus and knew him, that he plunged himself into the sea, and *swam* to him. The disciples were frightened, supposing they had seen a spirit; and when Peter swam to Jesus they were so much discomposed in mind, that they thought he *actually* walked on the water!

When the Historian relates the account of Christ's transfiguration, we are not to understand it literally! It is not probable that Christ's garments, or his visage, was in reality changed, or that there was in *reality* any voice heard. But, as the Historian says, while they were on the mount, a cloud arose and covered the mount, and a flash of lightning from the cloud produced this astonishing effect on his raiment and visage; and the clap of thunder (as some of the more sober ones conjecture,) was all the voice that was heard. These are the opinions of the German Theologians, and they are brethren of the Christians. A Reverend Doctor goes even farther. He told me the *death* of Christ was *only in appearance*. Here we see the course of the *Rationalists*. The German Theologians have adopted the principles of Hume, and the *Christians* the *principles* of Miss *Wright*.

Mr. Lane rose, and read the question, "Is the *man* Christ Jesus, the Supreme and Eternal God?" He then observed: My friends, the affirmative of this question my opponent agreed to sustain. He tells us there is but one God, and hence, according to his doctrine, there is no God but the *man* Christ Jesus! Now, as my opponent has accused me of believing in a material God, I ask if the *man* Christ Jesus was not *material?* Was he not born as other men are? Was he not flesh and blood?

I do not expect to follow the gentleman through all his wild rambles and wanderings, but when he comes into the region of the subject, he will find me on the ground ready to wait on him, and attend to his discourse. But I hope, in future, for the sake of his people, that he will keep within the regions of moral truth. He has told you that I believe in a *material God;* that I worship Jupiter; that we do not believe in a change of heart, or even the necessity of feeling a sorrow for sin; and that any person, short of murderers and horse thieves, are cordially received at our communions. Now, my friends, all these assertions which my opponent has made, together with many others which might be mentioned, are absolutely false.

My opponent tells us that the title Lord, given to Christ, proves him to be the Supreme and Eternal God. But we read, in the language of Scripture, "that same Jesus whom ye have crucified, hath God made both Lord and Christ." Besides, the same Scriptures inform us that the Lord Jesus had a Lord, who promised to make his foes his footstool, and exalt him to set at his right hand. Will my opponent inform us if he believes, that the Supreme God had a Lord who exalted him to sit at his right hand? or, in other words, does the Supreme God depend on another for protection and glory?

I must here repeat, that I am not responsible for what the German Theologians, Dr. Priestley, or Mr. Kinkade have written; nor do I believe in a material God, as my opponent affirms. But if the man Christ Jesus be the Supreme God, the Virgin Mary was his mother; and the Catholics should not be blamed for worshipping her.

Mr. M'Calla remarked, that the conduct of his opponent reminded him of a pedlar, who travelled in Kentucky, to sell trinkets and jewelry, and when he succeeded to sell them to the ladies, who were very fond of buying such things, and received his pay for them, he then persuaded the ladies how foolish it was to wear such things. He would often tell them such serious stories about their vanity, that they would give up their trinkets to him again.

Thus, my opponent, like this deceiver, comes among you, recommending a book, and telling you his views are better expressed in it, than he can explain them. But after the book is exposed, he tells you he is not accountable for what Mr. Kinkade has written; he is an old man, the book is good for nothing; but if you return it to him, he will recommend it, and sell it again!

Mr. M'Calla then resumed his descriptive and historical sketch of the Christians. He said, two-thirds of the Unitarians believed that Jesus was no more than a man, like Moses or John, and that he came into the world by ordinary generation. They do not believe in the miraculous conception, yet they call Christ the Son of God; supposing that the resurrection made him so. Thus, momentous things, held sacred by the ancient church, were turned into ridicule by these enemies of Jesus.

To confirm these hard sayings concerning the Unitarians, Mr. M'Calla informed the congregation, that Professor Holley, on his way to the West, told him that Jesus Christ was nothing more than a man, and had no existence until he was born of the Virgin Mary. He farther said, that in the course of the conversation, Professor Holley intimated, that Jesus Christ was sometimes enthusiastic, and disturbed the public peace. This was a liberal Christian! This was a Rationalist!

Mr. M'Calla then noticed the course of some Presbyterians in Kentucky, who became Christians. He said, there was a dissatisfaction in the Synod of Kentucky, that resulted in the separation of a number of preachers from the Synod, among whom were Stone, Marshall, M'Nemer, and Thompson. Some other disaffected persons united with them, and they assumed the name of *New*

Lights, and boasted of their discoveries, as much as if no body but themselves knew any thing. In a short time afterwards, they were called Christians, and then they became Shakers; but these are only the improvements of the *Rationalists*. They believed God was their father, and their reason taught them that they must have had a *mother;* so this mother was *Ann Lee!* Some of these, among whom were Marshall and Thompson, returned to the Presbyterians with tears in their eyes, and confessed their error and delusion.

Mr. Lane replied in the following manner:—My friends, I wish to know what relation a story about Kentucky pedlars, has to the question under discussion. The story does not apply to my case; for I always told the people there were some things in Mr. Kinkade's book, with which I do not agree. My opponent seems acquainted with the Christians in the West, and I doubt not that his knowledge arose from a somewhat disagreeable incident, for he had the misfortune to have a rencounter with one of our ministers in the West, and was severely worsted in the contest, and consequently soon afterwards left Kentucky.

From his account, you would be led to suppose, the Christians few in number in the western states, but the most authentic accounts give us not less than 300 ministers, and 15,000 commnnicants, west of the Alleghany mountains; and these comprise a respectable proportion of the inhabitants. But, my friends, it is true that after the great *revival* in Kentucky, some of the Christian denomination joined the Shakers; but a much larger number from the Presbyterians, joined them about the same time.

But to return to the question. When I adduce any passage, which positively declares that Jesus Christ is inferior to the Father, my opponent flees to the doctrine of two natures. Thus when it is said by Jesus, I can of myself do nothing, my opponent will tell you that Christ speaks this of his human nature only. My friends, I care not how many natures he may have, if he had five thousand, they were all included in the word, *myself*.

"When Trinitarians attempt to prove what they call the supreme deity of Jesus Christ, they always proceed on the assumption that he is both the supreme God and a real man. To prove that Christ is God, they quote those passages of scripture, which ascribe the same offices, attributes, and works to him that are in other parts of the book ascribed to God, and hence conclude that he must be God.

If this doctrine be true, then that very individual person, who is the supreme God, is in reality a man. If I should say of a human being, that he is a large man, six feet high, and sixty years old, and yet, at the same time, but a little infant three days old, it would not be so wide of the truth, as to say that the supreme God is really and properly a man; because there is a greater disparity between God and a man, than there can be between any two finite beings. God is a being, and man is a being, and if Jesus Christ is very God, and, at the same time, very man, then he must be two distinct beings, one of whom is infinitely superior to the other.

If Christ is really and properly the supreme God, and at the same time, really and properly a man, and yet but one individual being, then he must be both a created and an uncreated being. He must know all things, and not know all things. He must be, in every sense of the word, an independent being; and, at the same time, in every sense of the word, a dependant one. He must, independently of all other beings in the universe, be able to do every thing he pleases, and at the same time not be able, of his own self, to do any thing. If Christ is the supreme God, he is the Creator; if he is a man, he is not the Creator. If he is a man, he is a finite being; if he is the supreme God, he is not a finite being. If he is both God and man, and yet but one person, then he is what he is not, and is not the being that he is.

It is impossible to believe the testimony that says Christ is both God and man in one person, because it furnishes as much evidence to prove that he is neither God nor man, as it does to prove that he is both; because when I say that a person is a man, I as clearly affirm that he is not God, as if I should state in direct

words that he is not God; and when I say of the Almighty that he is the supreme God, it is as clear a denial that he is a man, as can be made in human speech."

Again, my opponent will tell you, that Jesus Christ is the second person of the Trinity, and that he is Almighty. But if Jesus Christ be the second person of the Trinity, the Almighty, and the supreme God, must he not be superior to the first and third persons? and does not this amount to a denial of the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ? If one person be supreme, the others must be subordinate, and if one be Almighty, the other two cannot, unless we admit the supposition, that there are three Almighties, which involves contradiction.

Mr. M'Calla assumed, that any worship, addressed to any other being but the supreme God, is idolatry, and thence inferred that if Christ be not the supreme God, the worship of him must be idolatry. He then read from Justin Martyr his opinions of the Logos, showing that he existed before all creatures, and consequently was not a creature; and that Christ had been worshipped by the first Christians. Mr. M'Calla also referred to other testimonies of the ancient Christians, to show that they regarded and worshipped Jesus as God. He then observed, that he had read those extracts to show, that the Christian fathers believed that Christ was God; and that he existed before the world with the Father; and that if Christ were not truly God, the early Christians, and first fathers of the church, must have been idolaters.

Mr. M'Calla then referred to the language of scripture, in confirmation of the worship of Christ, and dwelt on the account of Stephen, in the seventh chapter of the Acts; then appealing to the congregation, he said: there, my friends, we have the example of Stephen, when dying by the hands of his enemies, he called on Jesus as God, saying, "Lord Jesus, receive my spirit." But to whom would Stephen commend his spirit in the hour of death, except to the supreme and eternal God?

In further confirmation of the doctrine that Jesus is

God, and ought to be worshipped as such, he referred *to* the first chapter of the Epistle to the Hebrews, where he said, Christ is called God, and all the angels commanded to worship him.

Mr. Lane thus replied:—My friends, I feel much pleased that my opponent is coming over to my views on this subject. He has made two long extracts from Justin Martyr, to prove that Christ existed with the Father before the world was. *This sentiment*, my friends, *I always believed. That Christ existed before the world was, with the Father*, and *that the Father created the world by Christ, are doctrines of the Bible.* But his being with God, does not prove him to be the very God, with whom he then was.

My opponent has, during this debate, quoted the words of Christ, "I and my Father are one," as proof incontrovertible, that he was really the supreme and eternal God!! But before we admit this as proof, we will examine it. Let us then inquire, Can it be probable or possible for the eternal God to have a Father? But Jesus says, he and his Father are one. Now, whatever Jesus may be, this text declares, that he had a Father, with whom he subsisted in unity of design and co-operation.

My opponent has told us how much the orthodox and their doctrine, have been opposed in all ages. How severely they have been oppressed. But where they possessed the power, what have they done? Who hung the Quakers in Boston? Who banished the Baptists? Who made the Blue Laws of Connecticut? And who burned the poor Salem witches? But my opponent has told us, that the Christians in the West are few in number; notwithstanding he forgot himself, and told us before he got through, that the Christians had a stone church in a certain place, where he had to preach in the woods.

In the reference of my opponent to Stephen, he has been unsuccessful; for the word God is not in the ori-

ginal Greek: and it is evident that Stephen could not believe Jesus to be the supreme God, for he saw Jesus standing at the right hand of this God; and, doubtless, he saw as clearly as my opponent, or any other man from Kentucky.

END OF THE THIRD DAY.

NOTICE TO THE READER.

This abridged account of this day's controversy, being the third of the debate, will appear very compressed, and perhaps, be considered incomplete and defective; but we have restrained the report to those particulars which had some bearing on the subject of discussion; being persuaded that mere disputation, about the credit or influence of sects or persons, can have no good or abiding tendency, to promote charity or religion among mankind, which is the great object we ever ought to keep in view. This day's debate was peculiarly unhappy, on account of the animosities, party spirit, and altercations, wanderings, and unnecessary digressions from the proper investigation of the question, which should have occupied much more of the debaters' attention

FOURTH DAY.

Mr. Lane opened the debate in this manner:—My friends, you easily perceive that the course taken by my opponent, for the past three days of this discussion, has been only abusive and evasive. He has seldom, during the three days, named the question, or adduced proof directly, or indirectly, of the truth of the proposition he has agreed to sustain. He has spoken to us about the German theologians, the Unitarians of England, and the Shakers; but he seems to be afraid to appeal to the Bible, for he knows his doctrine will not stand the test. My opponent would represent me as a believer in a *material God*, and two-thirds of the Christians as without grace. But why does he continue to repeat unwarrantable assertions, and load us with every disgraceful epithet? You see, my friends, it is because he is destitute of argument. He laboured yesterday to prove that Christ was the *Son* of God: this is just the doctrine I came here to maintain. But he told us also that Christ was the *eternal* Son of God; yet the book no where says that he is the *eternal Son*, for that would be eternal nonsense.

My opponent tells us, he believes in that part of his Confession of Faith, which teaches that the two natures of Christ were so united as never to be divided; that there are three persons, or personal distinctions, in the deity, and yet he is only one being. Now, if I understand the gentleman, he means that they are one in the same sense that Cicero the orator, Cicero the philosopher, and Cicero the statesman, was one. If this be the sense in which he believes them to be one, I ask, if there would be any propriety in saying, Cicero the orator sat down at the right hand of Cicero the philosopher? Or if Cicero the orator was killed, would either Cicero the philosopher, or Cicero the statesman, continue to live?

My opponent has quoted Heb. i. 8, "Thy throne, O God, is for ever and ever!!" as a plain declaration that

Jesus Christ is the supreme and eternal God. But why did he not read the connexion? the reason is, because he dare not. I will read it. The context informs us, that Jesus Christ obtained his name by inheritance; that is, he obtained his name from his Father. But does my opponent believe, that the supreme and eternal God inherits his name from another? If so, will he inform us who were the predecessors of the supreme God?

For the sake of argument, I have admitted the text as it stands in our translation, but I firmly believe the text should read, "*God is thy throne for ever and ever.*"

Mr. M'Calla observed:—My opponent has found another passage which is not translated, to suit him. Yet you will remember he knows nothing about the original! The passage, I know, is very much opposed to his doctrine. But that in our present translation, it is correctly rendered, can be supported by unquestionable authority. But you see, my friends, this blasphemer would take from us our divine Saviour. Here Mr. M. related a story about a certain old woman, who went to hear a certain famous Doctor preach. The sentiments advanced by the preacher, were such as affected her even to tears. He observed her weeping, and addressed her in the language of our Saviour to Mary, "Woman, why weepest thou?" She instantly rejoined, in the language of Mary, "Because thou hast taken away my Lord, and I know not where thou hast lain him." God smote the heart of this blasphemous preacher, and for a moment, he turned his back on his congregation, and wept bitterly.

I did not say, as my opponent has asserted, that two-thirds of the *Christians* were destitute of *grace*. You know, my friends, that I never said any such thing. But you must understand my opponent by contraries; when he tells you that I said so, you must understand him to *mean*, that I did not say so. To say that *two-thirds* of the Christians are destitute of *grace*, would be to admit that *some of them* have grace; which I should be very sorry to admit—for how can they have grace when

they deny the Lord, that bought them—when they *impugn* the inspiration of the sacred scriptures, and call the writers drunkards! They are all *Materialists* and *Atheists*, as much as Frances Wright.

Mr. M'Calla then commented on the eighth chapter of Proverbs. He said it was clearly taught in that chapter, that Jesus Christ, who is there designated by the appellation Wisdom, was from eternity. Notwithstanding the blasphemous and ridiculous manner in which my opponent sneers at the idea of one God being brought up with another!

Mr. M'Calla then alleged the first chapter of the Hebrews, as evidence of the two natures; the pre-existent and glorious person of the Son, and the subsequent incarnation of this divine person, who, notwithstanding the objections of his opponent, was truly man. And the whole nature of man he understood to be implied in the phrase, "*Son of Man.*"

Mr. Lane replied thus: My opponent seems to think it would be a very wicked thing to allow that any of us have grace; there is probably a reason for this. He does not believe that there is a fulness in Christ for all; and as the Presbyterians are numerous, he thinks there is no more than will suffice for them.

I did not say that the Son of Man was not a man. I do not doubt this; but I do say that because Jesus Christ is the Son of God, it does not follow that he is that God whose Son he is. There is not logic enough on this side of the Blue Licks to prove it!

My opponent tells you because I cannot believe that the first chapter of Hebrews contains any proof that the man Christ Jesus is the Supreme and Eternal God, that I am an infidel and a blasphemer. Now, whoever the person was of whom Paul makes mention, it is certain that he had a God, for it it is said to him, "therefore God, even thy God, hath anointed thee with the oil of gladness above thy fellows. If the passage just quoted refers to the Supreme and Eternal God, let me ask, if

the Supreme and Eternal God has a God? If the Supreme and Eternal God was ever anointed? If so, who anointed him? If the Supreme and Eternal God has any fellows? If so, who are they? In consideration of all this, who can believe that the text under consideration, refers to the Supreme and Eternal God? Because we cannot believe the gentleman's bare assertions, against the tenor of Scripture, in the face and eyes of common sense, we must be called Atheists, and stigmatized with every other hard name.

My opponent says, "the beginning of the creation of God," Rev. iii. 17, means the *Author of the creation.* He told us yesterday, that a human soul and body constituted the man. Now his doctrine is, that the man Christ Jesus is the Author of creation. That is, he believes that the worlds were made by a human soul and body!

My opponent says yes, and quotes Isaiah ix. 6, to prove it, and tells you that I will attempt to prove it false, or that I will say that it is false. This is not so. My friends, I have not attempted to prove this text false, but I did prove from this text that his doctrine was false, at least as far as it depends on the passage for support.

Mr. M'Calla rose, and thus addressed the congregation: When the Jews accused our Ssviour of making himself *God*, how easily would the doctrine of my opponent have pacified them. If he had only said to them, I did not make myself *God*, as you supposed, they would have peaceably left him, and perhaps have gone to drinking and playing cards, as I fear some men do, after hearing my opponent. But Jesus does not recede from his lofty claim, nor does he even attempt to undeceive them, (if indeed they were deceived.)

My opponent came into this neighborhood to disturb the order of society, and to destroy the peace of husbands and wives, parents and children. He now struts about the town, bantering and vaporing like Goliath. I have come in opposition to his blasphemy, to prove that

Jesus Christ is the Supreme God, and for this purpose I have quoted Isaiah ix. 6, in which this doctrine is fully expressed, and also Romans ix. 5, where Christ is called "God over all, blessed forever," and I now refer you to 1 John, 5, 7. There are three that bear record in heaven, the Father, the Word, and the Holy Ghost; and these three are *one*. Here the doctrine for which I contend, is fully expressed. Again, the same writer says in verse 20, of this same chapter, "This is the true God and eternal life." Now as there is no antecedent for the relative pronoun *this*, but Jesus Christ, it follows that *Jesus Christ is the true God and Eternal Life*. We have before proved that Jesus Christ was properly man, and from these passages it is clearly proved that he is God. But these Rationalists will tell us that these passages were not inspired. And thus they would take away our Bible, leaf by leaf.

But there is another method of proving the proposition. *Jesus Christ possesses all the attributes of God, therefore he must be God.*

1st. *Omnipresence.* He says: "Lo, I am with you always, even to the end of the world." Here our Lord declares his efficient presence with his disciples, *always* to the end of the world! Who could pronounce these words, but the Supreme and Eternal God? Again, "Where two or three are gathered together in my name, there am I in the midst of them." Who could make this promise but the Omnipresent God?

2nd. Jesus Christ possesses the attribute of Omnipresence. "Now we are sure that thou knowest all things." John xvi. 30. Who possesses this divine attribute of Omniscience but God?

3rd. Jesus Christ possesses the attribute of Omnipotence. This he asserts in so many words, "I am Alpha and Omega, the first and the last, the *Almighty*." And being possessed of this authority, he says to the paralytic, "Son, thy sins be forgiven thee." Who can forgive sins but God only?

Mr. Lane replied: I am accused by my opponent of coming into this neighborhood to destroy the peace of society—to set husbands and wives, parents and children, at variance. But, my friends, I come into this neighborhood to preach the doctrine of Christianity, as revealed in the Bible, that there is one God, and one Mediator between God and men, the man, Christ Jesus, which Paul preached before me. All the disturbance that has been made, was occasioned by some of the self styled orthodox, who flew into a violent passion at hearing this doctrine.

My opponent has quoted Rom. ix. 5, "Who is over all, God blessed forever," as a proof that Jesus Christ is the Supreme and Eternal God. Yet all that this passage says of Jesus Christ is, that "he is over all." This is explained by the Apostle Paul in 1 Cor. 15, 37, where he tells us that God hath put all things under Christ's feet. But the Apostle immediately adds, "When he saith all things are put under his feet, it is manifest He is excepted who put all things under him." In the above passage, it is manifest *that God put all things under his Son.* Does my opponent believe, that the Supreme and Eternal God is dependent on another being for the authority by which his enemies are subdued? But the Apostle continues, "When all things shall be subdued unto him, then shall the Son also himself be subject to *Him that put all things under him.*"

My opponent next notices 1 John, 5, 20. "We know that the Son of God is come, and hath given us an understanding that we may know him that is true; and we are in him that is true, even in his Son Jesus Christ, this is the True and Eternal Life." All the arguments that my opponent has drawn from this text is, that the relative pronoun *this*, has no antecedent in the text but Jesus Christ, therefore Jesus Christ must be the True God and Eternal Life." But let us compare 2 John, 7, "Many deceivers are entered into the world who confess not that Jesus Christ is come in the flesh. This is a deceiver and Anti-Christ." In this text the relative pronoun this has no antecedent but Jesus Christ, therefore, by the same rule as my opponent has applied to 1 John, 5, 20, this

text would teach that Jesus Christ is a deceiver, and Anti-Christ.

In the next place my opponent has asserted that Jesus Christ was the God of Abraham, of Isaac, and of Jacob, and the God of Israel. But the Bible does not teach such a doctrine. The Bible tells us that Jesus Christ was the Son of that God, therefore I shall leave the gentleman on this point to quarrel with the Bible. In one speech the gentleman tells us that Jesus Christ is properly a man, that he was crucified, and laid in Joseph's new tomb; but in the next speech affirms that Jesus Christ, who was a Child born, a Son given, a *Man* of sorrow and acquainted with grief, was the only Lord God. But he cannot explain this *deep mystery, and we must not examine it.* Any man who can believe all these absurdities and contradictions, I think, should find no difficulty in giving credence to all the doctrines of the Roman Church, *transubstantiation* not excepted.

My opponent proceeds to prove Christ's supreme divinity from his attributes. 1st. To prove his omniscience, he quotes John x. 30, "We are sure that thou knowest all things." But Jesus Christ declares: "Of that day and hour knoweth no man, no, not the angels in heaven, *neither the Son*, but the Father," Mark xiii. 32. In 1 John, 2, 20, we read: "Ye have an unction from the Holy One, and ye know all things." But I suspect my opponent would not argue from this, that the Christians to whom John wrote, were omniscient, although this would be as good a proof for the latter case, as the one he has quoted to prove that Jesus Christ was Omniscient. 2nd. To prove his Omnipotence, he quotes Rev. i. 8, "I am Alpha and Omega *saith* the Lord who is the Almighty." The speaker is here supposed to be not Christ, but his Father, hence the best copies read: "Saith the Lord God." 3rd. His Omnipresence. In proof of this he quotes, "Where two or three are gathered together in my name, there am I in the midst of them." The sun shines in all places at once, and produces effects on our world, but the sun itself is in reality millions of miles from us. If this passage proves that Jesus Christ was Omnipresent, the assertion of the Apostle Paul would

also prove him to be Omnipresent, for he says, "though absent in body, yet I am present in spirit, joying, and beholding your order and the steadfastness of your faith."

Mr. M'Calla replied by affirming that there was blasphemy between him and his opponent, and that doubtless he was guilty who refuses to honor the Son. My opponent, said he, will tell us sometimes, as Mr. Kinkade does, that Jesus Christ is God, and that he is to be worshipped; and at another time, he will tell us that Christ is not God in any sense. But this deception is very common among the enemies of our Lord's Divinity. When Socinus was accused of denying the Deity of Christ, he positively disavowed the charge, and called God to witness, that he believed the holy doctrine of the Trinity. Yet, after his death, it was found by his papers, that he had written largely on this heresy.

My opponent says he does not believe in a Material God. But that they do believe in a Material God, could easily be shown from Mr. Kinkade's Book, however I will not insist, for I was advised this morning to lay by a work so full of abominations. My opponent tells you he does not believe in a *Material God*, but that *I do*. It is natural enough for *boys*, when they can't do any more, to turn round and call bad names!

The *Man* Christ Jesus, the Child born, the Son given, is declared in the Scriptures to be the God of Israel, Jehovah of Hosts, the only True God, the *Mighty God*, the *Almighty*, the King of Kings, and the Lord of Lords. Now if the Man Christ Jesus be not the Supreme and Eternal God, *there is no God!* What can be said of God the Father, more than is said of God the Son? I have already proved, from a number of plain passages of Scripture, *that Jesus Christ possesses all the attributes of God.* I exhort you, my friends, to study the Bible, and not creeds; for the Bible fully teaches us that our divine Jesus is God, by ascribing to him the names, attributes, works, and worship, which are ascribed to the Supreme and Eternal God.

Mr. Lane spoke thus:—My opponent has quoted 1 John v. 7, "there are three that bear record in heaven, the Father, the Word, and the Spirit; and these three are one." Although there is every reason to question the genuineness of this text, yet as my opponent lays much stress on it, for argument's sake, we will admit its genuineness. The apostle is discoursing in this chapter, concerning the faith that overcometh the world. Hence he says, "whosoever is born of God, overcometh the world: and this is the victory that overcometh the world, even our faith." Who is he that overcometh the world, but he that believeth that Jesus is the Son of God? For there are three that bear record in heaven, the Father, the Word, and the Holy Spirit; and these three are one. That is, they bear record to the faith that overcometh the world. Now, what is the faith that overcometh the world? It is, that *Jesus is the Son of God.* These *three*, the Father, the Word, and the Holy Spirit, are all *one* in their *testimony.* "If we receive the witness of men, the witness of God is greater; for this is the witness of God, which he hath testified of his Son." *This is the record that* God *bears* of *his Son.* Now we know, my friends, that this is the *record* that he gave of Jesus, *uniformly;* he calls him his *Son*, his well *beloved Son.* Jesus bears *record* to the same divine truth, by never, in *one instance*, professing to be any other than the *Son* of God. The Holy Spirit bears *record* to the same glorious doctrine, by moving the sacred penmen to write it in the clearest possible language; and this they have done.

But, says my opponent, these three are *one God;* for so it reads in his Confession of Faith: but the *Bible* says nothing about this language of *Ashdod.* Now in what sense are they regarded as *one* in scripture? In the same sense that all Christians are *one.* In John xvii. 22, Jesus says, "the glory which thou gavest me, have I given them; that *they* may be *one*—even as we are one." Here we see, that in the same sense that Christ and his Father are one, Christ prays that his disciples may be one. Did he pray that they might be *one person?* The apostle tells his brethren that they are all *one* in Christ Jesus. Did Paul mean that his brethren were

all one person? Again, Paul says, "He that planteth, and he that watereth, are all one." And immediately afterward, he says, it was Paul that planted, and Apollos that watered. Thus Paul and Apollos are one.

If the three Heavenly Witnesses be one, in the sense for which my opponent contends, that is, that they are all one *being;* if this be strictly true, when we speak of the Father, we *mean* the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, for there is only one *Being*. If we speak of the Son, we mean to include the Father and Spirit, because there is only one *being* in three persons. Then if the Son *died*, they all *died;* for there is only one *being*. If the Virgin Mary was the *mother* of Christ, she was the *mother* of all three, Father, Son, and Holy Ghost; for my opponent tells us, they are one being, or one *individual*. Notwithstanding he flies from this, to talk about the two-natured scheme, thinking probably that this will help him out of his difficulty. But, I ask, if Jesus Christ possess two whole and complete natures, God and man, in one person, *never* to be divided, for this is the reading of his creed, when my opponent worships the supreme and eternal God, which is only the divine nature of Christ, does he not also worship a mere man? How can he worship the one without the other, when he affirms there is but one person; and this person, a compounded being, part God and part of man, is the only object of worship? This is all the God he has. Now if this is not unintelligible, I do not know what is! and yet, my friends, we must believe all my opponent's contradictions, or be denounced as heretics, and branded with every hard name that the vocabulary can furnish him.

Mr. M'Calla then addressed the congregation thus:—My friends, I could have read all that my opponent has said, from Kinkade's book; and I could readily answer his speech, but I am not disposed to consume time, in replying to his irreverent language. I think I have shown that there is sufficient proof in the Bible, that there are *three persons*, or intelligent agents, in the God-

head; for what I mean by a person is an intelligent agent. The Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, are these three intelligent agents. The Father was not incarnate, nor the Holy Spirit, but the Son only, who is the second person. We do not confound these persons, as my opponent has told you, because the sacred writers always preserve a distinction. In the scriptures, the Father never means the Son; nor the Son the Father; nor does the Holy Ghost ever mean the Father, or the Son.

I shall now proceed to give you some additional proof of Christ's supreme deity, drawn from another class of arguments.

1st. From his works. It is said, "by him were all things created that are in Heaven and that are in earth, visible or invisible, whether they be thrones, dominions, principalities, or powers," Col. i. 16. The inspired Evangelist bears testimony to the same doctrine: "by him were all things made;" and again, "all things were made by him, and without him was not any thing made that was made;" "all things were created by him and for him." From these passages, we infer that Jesus Christ is the creator of all things, and he that made all things must be *God*.

2d. He is the judge of all. It is written, "we must all appear before the judgment seat of Christ." Jesus Christ himself declares, "the Son of man shall come in his glory, and all the holy angels with him; and then shall he sit upon the throne of his glory." Paul bears testimony to the same doctrine, "for we must all stand before the judgment seat of Christ;" again, it is declared that "the Lord Jesus shall judge the quick and the dead at his appearing and kingdom." It is evident that he who will preside over the scene of the final judgment, is God. It is said, "God is the judge of all;" therefore Jesus Christ must be God.

3d. Christ is described in the scriptures, as the author of the resurrection. "The dead shall hear the voice of the Son of God, and they that hear shall live." Again, "The hour is coming, in which all that are in their graves, shall hear the voice of the Son of God, and shall come forth, they that have done good to the resurrection

of life, and they that have done evil to the resurrection of damnation." In these passages the Evangelist declares, that Jesus Christ is the author of the resurrection.

From these arguments, it appears that Jesus Christ is God; and the admission of the doctrine, that the Father begat him, and sent him into the world, is no objection to the doctrine of the scriptures, that he is truly God. It has been alleged that all Christ's power was delegated to him by the Father: but is not the notion of a delegated omnipotence wholly absurd.

Mr. Lane rose, and observed to the congregation:—My friends, I feel certain that there is nothing needed to prove the weakness of the Trinitarian arguments, but only to expose them.

My opponent comes forward like a true Protestant, to prove his doctrine from the Bible. He asserts that Christ is the author of creation. As proof, he quotes a number of passages, in which it is said, "all things were made by Christ;" and closes with the inference, "therefore Christ who is the *Creator*, must be the supreme and eternal God." Now, my friends, Paul did not believe the doctrine of my opponent. He says indeed, "all things were made by Christ;" but he tells us that "*God made all things by Jesus Christ.*" This doctrine of the apostle does not teach that Jesus Christ is the *Creator*, but that God is the *sole Creator*, and Jesus Christ only the *instrument* in the creation.

In the second place, he undertakes to prove the supreme divinity of Christ, from those scriptures that declare Christ shall judge the world. But Paul destroys my opponent's labour again, by telling us, "that *God hath* appointed a day, in *which he will judge* the *secrets* of men's hearts *by Christ Jesus.*" Here Christ is represented, not as the supreme, but the subordinate judge, in the great day. Even my opponent forgot his object, and told you the truth, "that the *Father hath committed* all judgment *to* the *Son.*

My opponent has given us a definition of the word

person; he says it signifies an *intelligent agent.* Then there are three intelligent agents in the Godhead. But he has told us that *God is one* and *indivisible.* Again, he affirms that the three persons in the Godhead are never confounded; and now he tells us, that the three persons are three intelligent agents. Thus, according to my opponent's doctrine, when Jesus Christ, who is the second intelligent agent and the supreme God, was baptized, the Father, who is the first intelligent agent, and without body, parts, or passions, audibly declares of Christ, who is the second intelligent agent, and the supreme and eternal God, "this is my beloved Son, in whom I am well pleased." Now the third intelligent agent, who also *is* really God, according to opponent's doctrine, and exists without body, parts, or passions, comes fluttering down from heaven, and lights on the head of the second intelligent agent. Again, the first intelligent agent takes the third, and anoints the second with the third.

Again, one of the three intelligent agents, that compose the Trinity, becomes some how mysteriously united to a man, so that two whole and perfect natures are united in one person, never to be separated; and yet one of them was in heaven, and the other on the banks of the Jordan!

My opponent has found, after three days' hard labour, that he cannot succeed by *slander* and *misrepresentation;* and, therefore, if he succeed at all, it must be by the sword of the Spirit, which is the word of God. When he made search for this sword, he found that I held it in my hand; and endeavouring to take it from me, he got hold of the wrong end, and only cut his own fingers.

How different is the plain doctrine of the Bible from my opponent's mysterious jargon! The Bible positively declares, "*there is but one God, the Father,*" 2 Cor. viii. 5. But my opponent wishes to prove that Paul was mistaken, and that there are two other persons in the Godhead, each of which is as perfectly God as the Father. Now, my friends, as long as that passage is in God Almighty's book, my opponent will be unable to prove his doctrine. Though he stop, as he promised last evening, until the end of another week, his

efforts will only tend to satisfy the people, that he cannot sustain the affirmative of the proposition, nor make it apparent by any process of reasoning, that Jesus is the supreme and eternal God.

Mr. M'Calla then arose, and began his reply thus:—I shall not attempt to answer the quotations, or what may be considered the arguments, of this *blasphemer;* but although I do not attend to them, I hope none will consider them unanswerable.

Mr. M'Calla then proceeded to give another proof of Christ's supreme deity, from the fact that divine homage was paid to him. In his remarks, he commented on the following passage: "Cursed is the man that trusteth in man, or maketh flesh his arm." Here he observed: It is idolatry to worship any being but the supreme and eternal God, and yet the angels of heaven are commanded to "worship the Son." Therefore, the Son must be the supreme and eternal God. Moreover, when the devil tempted Christ to fall down and worship him, he said, "Get thee hence, Satan, for it is written, thou shalt worship the Lord thy God, and him only shalt thou serve." But the scriptures command the worship of Jesus Christ, and therefore he must be the supreme and eternal God.

CONCLUSION OF THE DEBATE.

Whilst Mr. M'Calla thus reasoned, Mr. Clough smiled, and Mr. M'Calla stopped in his discourse, and wished the Board of Moderators to remove Mr. Clough from the pulpit; "because," he said, "he did not wish a man stuck up there, to laugh in his face."

Mr. Badger then arose, and addressed the president as follows:—Sir, there is nothing in our rules of discussion, that directs any man to sit, or stand, or in what part of this house he should take his station."

Mr. M'Calla observed: "I perceive this man is de-

termined not to obey the Board of Moderators. I understood last evening these men had formed a plot to break up this debate."

Mr. Badger continued his address to the president: "Mr. M'Calla has preferred a charge against us, of laying a plot to break up this debate. It is far from our wish that it should terminate abruptly, for we have sacrificed our appointments, and prepared for a long session; and rather than the debate should stop, before there is a proper understanding of this subject, as soon as Mr. M'Calla and Mr. Lane have got through, we are ready to meet every *Trinitarian clergyman* on the ground. I *demand* his *author*." This *demand* was considered by the Board, not a question in order.

Mr. Clough then demanded his right to speak in his own defence, inasmuch as his name had been publicly used. But the president very respectfully invited him to come down and address the Board. Accordingly he came down, and addressed the president as follows: "Sir, I confess I did smile, and I confess I could not help it; for when the gentleman said, Jesus Christ must be the supreme God, because he refused to bow down and worship the devil, his reasoning appeared so ridiculous, and utterly contemptible, that I could not keep the muscles of my face straight. I had taken my station in the pulpit, for the purpose, if Mr. M'Calla referred to the original scriptures, to render Mr. Lane some assistance on that referrence, according to the provision of the 10th article of the Rules. But I have not been called to render that assistance, and as Mr. Lane is evidently an overmatch for his opponent, he does not need my assistance."

The board then decided that Mr. M'Calla should proceed. Mr. M'Calla commenced, by reading the challenge given him by Mr. Clough, and observed: "I did accept this challenge, but the conduct of Mr. Clough today, has put it out of my power to meet him." At which Mr. Clough exclaimed, "*Coward!!*"

When order was restored, Mr. M'Calla proceeded to make some confused remarks, and exhort his brethren to pray for Unitarians as *poor deluded creatures!!* Then,

after a short ejaculatory prayer to the Holy Trinity, he closed before his time had expired, saying, "I relinquish the debate for the present." Mr. Lane then attempted to speak, but Mr. Wiggins objected, saying, "Mr. M'Calla has not given up the debate." The president then asked this question, "Mr. M'Calla, do you give up the debate?" Mr. M'Calla replied, "*I do relinquish it for ever!*" The president then observed, "that according to the rules of discussion, Mr. Lane had a right to proceed until he was satisfied:" and an adjournment was announced until 10 o'clock the next day.

The audience which had paid the most profound attention for four days, now burst into one general shout of triumph! This general shout was, "the *great Mr. M'Calla, from Philadelphia, is completely defeated!* Even the ladies on the left, were clapping their hands, repeating in softer notes, "*the great Mr. M'Calla is beat!!!*" A gentleman in the congregation exclaimed, "*The great Mr. M'Calla, the champion of the Trinitarians, is completely vanquished by a boy, and is afraid to meet a man!!!*"

As Mr. M'Calla came down from the pulpit, a gentleman met him, who observed, "Now, Mr. M'Calla, I can give you my hand, and advise you never to come to this place again!!" And when Mr. M'Calla and his friends got out of doors, their ears were greeted with the unwelcome exultations of the people, calling one to another, "*Trinitarianism is down!*"

Mr. Lane came down from the pulpit, and while shaking hands with his numerous friends, observed, "*Let God have all the glory.*" Mr. Thompson then raised a hymn, which was sung with rapture, and we departed in peace.

END OF THE FOURTH DAY.

FIFTH DAY.

Having met, agreeably to adjournment, on the morning of Saturday, Mr. Lane opened the meeting, and observed that, as his opponent had relinquished the debate, he had no desire to prosecute the argument, but would merely recapitulate a few particulars. He said he had proved, by incontrovertible evidence, that there exists only one independent and Eternal God, the Father; and that this God exists in one person. That Jesus Christ is the proper and only-begotten Son of this One Eternal God, but he had equally shown, that this Son cannot be coeval with the Father, nor identically the same being as his Father. He said his opponent had admitted that the supreme God was not the Son of any other God; that he was never *born*, nor *sent* to do the will of another; that he did not suffer; that he was not dead and buried. Now my opponent admits all this, and the scriptures, in the most unqualified language, affirm all this concerning Jesus Christ. I have further proved, that whatever authority Jesus possessed, he received it all from his Father; and that he uniformly acknowledged his dependance on his Father for all things. Hence we are irresistibly led to the conclusion, that Jesus could not be the *unoriginated*, *independent*, and *eternal God*.

Mr. Lane then proceeded to notice the grounds on which he could fellowship Trinitarians. Both the Trinitarians and Christians believed and worshipped the same God, only they differed in opinion as to the mode of his existence: both believed in Jesus Christ, only they differed as to his rank; the one supposing him to be the supreme God, the other regarding him as the Son of God. They both believed that the mission of Christ had the same definite object in view, the salvation of mankind; but they differed as to the manner in which this great end shall be accomplished. They both believed that man was in a state of moral starvation, and on the brink of ruin; and that a glorious Messenger from heaven

had visited our ruined world, bearing the glad tidings of salvation. In all this, Trinitarians and the Christians were agreed.

To illustrate this statement, he used the following comparison:—Let us suppose that we are all in a state of starvation, surrounded by an enemy, and reduced to the last extremity. Without some extraordinary interposition, we must all inevitably perish. Whilst in these alarming circumstances, let us suppose that an ample supply of provisions is forwarded from Washington. Our ears are saluted with the joyful report of plenty—a festival is announced—and we are all invited to share in the rich repast. But a question arises: Who has furnished these provisions? One says the President came in disguise, and in person administered to our necessities. Another says not so. He who procured these provisions, is the Son of the President. A third exclaims, you have both mistaken; the provisions indeed came to us as the benevolent expression of the fatherly care of the President; but he who brought them to us was neither the President, nor his son, but the officer of state, who holds the next rank to the President. Now, notwithstanding this diversity of opinion, they all agree that the provisions are good, and the President affectionate and beneficent. Therefore there should be no dispute, nor should any thing prevent their social intercourse and fellowship at the board of plenty.

Mr. Lane then observed, that as he did not anticipate the abrupt departure of his opponent, but had expected the debate to continue for several days, he had, agreeably to the request of his opponent, furnished on a written paper, a number of arguments in opposition to the doctrine affirmed in the proposition which had been adopted for discussion, which he would now read

ARGUMENTS

AGAINST THE DOCTRINE OF THE

SUPREME DEITY OF CHRIST.

1st. Jesus Christ is not the supreme and eternal God, because he is represented by the sacred writers to be as distinct from God the Father, as one man is from another. "It is written in your law, the testimony of *two men is true. I am one*, who beareth witness of myself, and the Father that sent me beareth witness of me." John viii. 17, 18.

2d. Jesus never professed to be the true God, but, on the contrary, he declared that the Father who sent him, is the only true God. "This is life eternal, that they might know *thee, the only true God*, and Jesus Christ whom thou hast sent." John xvii. 3.

3d. Jesus Christ is declared in many instances, to be the *Son of the only true God;* and this only true God said of Jesus, at two different times, at his baptism and transfiguration, with an audible voice from heaven, "this is my beloved Son."

4th. Jesus Christ is represented as a *Mediator* between God and men. For there is *one God* and *one Mediator between God and men*, the man Christ Jesus." 1 Tim. ii. 5. *Can God mediate between himself and men?*

5th. Jesus Christ is declared in scripture to be sent, and appointed by the Father. "We have seen and do testify, that the *Father sent the Son.*" 1 John iv. 14. "Christ Jesus who was faithful to *him* that appointed *him.*" Heb. iii. 1, 2. Was the supreme and eternal God *ever sent or appointed by another being?*

6th. Jesus Christ is represented as our *Intercessor with God.* "It is Christ that died, yea, rather that is risen again, who is ever at the right hand of God, who also maketh intercession for us." Rom. viii. 34. He that intercedes with God, *cannot be that God with whom he intercedes.*"

7th. Paul declares, "To us there is but *one God, the Father.*" 1 Cor. viii. 6. Do not the opposers of the divine unity flatly contradict the apostle, by asserting that there are *two other persons in the Godhead, each of which is as truly God as the Father?*

8th. Jesus Christ was "approved of God by signs and wonders, which *God did by him.*" Acts ii. 22. Is the supreme and eternal God ever represented as the *instrument*, by which signs and wonders have been performed?

9th. Jesus Christ positively declares, and that without the least qualification, "My *Father is greater than I.*" John xiv. 28. Is there any being superior to the supreme God?

10th. Jesus Christ positively denies that he was the author of the miracles, by declaring, "the *Father who dwelleth in me doeth the work.*" John xiv. 10. Does not Christ here ascribe his miracles to the power of God.

12th. Jesus declares that he is not the author of that system of truth which he published. "My doctrine is not mine, but his that sent me." John vii. 16, 17. "*As my Father hath taught me, I speak these things.*" John viii. 28. Is the supreme and eternal God, *dependant on another for instruction?*

13th. Jesus Christ invariably refers to the *Father the authority*, by which he spake and acted. "The Fathor hath *given* to the Son authority," &c. John v. 26, 27. Has the supreme God a father, from whom he receives authority? or is the Almighty dependent on the will of another?

14th. Jesus Christ declares he has not the disposal of the highest place in his kingdom. Mat. xx. 23. Has the supreme and eternal God not the disposal of the highest place in the kingdom of heaven?

15th. Jesus Christ is uniformly represented in scripture, not as the first, but as the *intermediate* cause of the great works ascribed to him. "There is one God, the Father, of whom are all things, and *one Lord Jesus Christ, by whom* are all things." 1 Cor. viii. 6.

16th. Jesus Christ expressly disavows the divine attribute of *self-existence.* "As the Father hath *sent me, and I live by the Father,*" &c. John vi. 57. "As the

Father hath life in himself, so hath he *given to the Son*, to have life in himself." John v. 26. Did the supreme and eternal God derive life and being from another?

17th. Jesus Christ positively disclaims the divine attribute of *omniscience*. "But of that day and hour knoweth no man, no, not the angels of heaven, *neither the Son*, but the *Father only*." Mark xiii. 32. Is there any thing of which the *supreme God* is *ignorant?*

18th. Jesus Christ prayed to God. Luke xvi. 12. We have a specimen of his prayers: "O Father, glorify thou me, with thy own self, with the glory I had with thee before the world was." John xvii. 5. And on the cross, he cried, "My God, my God, why hast thou *forsaken* me." Mat. xxviii. 46. Could these prayers and exclamations be uttered by the supreme God?

19th. Jesus Christ never instructed his disciples to *worship himself*, nor the *Holy Spirit*, but the *Father only*. "They that worship the Father, must worship him in spirit and truth." John iv. 23.

20th. According to the scriptures, religious homage is uniformly paid, not to Christ, *but to God, the Father, through Christ*. "I thank God *through Jesus Christ*." Rom. vii. 25. "To God only wise, be glory *through* Christ." Rom. xvi. 7.

21st. Jesus Christ is represented by the New Testament writers, as the "*Image of God*." Col. i. 15. 2 Cor. iv. 4. Would it not be absurd to call any one *his own image?*

22d. Jesus Christ is called in scripture, "the *first born* amony many *brethren*." Rom. viii. 27. But the supreme God has no brethren.

23d. Jesus Christ is represented as receiving commands from the Father. "The Father who sent me, *gave* me a commandment." John xii. 49. "Even as the *Father said unto me*, so *I speak*." John xii. 50. "I have kept my Father's commandments." John xv. 10. Can this be said of the *true God*, without *denying the omnipotent Jehovah?*

24th. The scriptures teach us, that God the Father hath highly exalted the Lord Jesus Christ, and *given* him *a name which* "is above every other name." Phil. ii. 9.

25th. When Paul says, all things are put under Christ, he immediately adds, "it is *manifested that he is excepted, who hath put all things under him.*" 1 Cor. xv. 27. And "when all things shall be subdued to Christ, then shall the *Son also himself be subject to him that put all things under him.*" 1 Cor. xv. 28. Will Almighty God ever be subject to another being, on whom he is dependant for the power by which his enemies are subdued?

26th. Christ is *appointed* by God to be the judge of the quick and dead. Acts x. 42. The *Father* has *committed* all judgment to the *Son.* John v. 22. Was the *supreme* and *eternal God ever appointed by his Father to judge the world?*

27th. God has an "*only begotten Son.*" John iii. 18. Was Jesus Christ an only begotten Son? If so, can he be God the Father?

28th. The Jews, who best understood their own prophecies, expected their Messiah should be inferior to, and dependent on the supreme God; and yet our Saviour never intimated that this opinion was erroneous.

29th. There are, in the *New Testament*, seventeen passages, wherein the Father is styled the ONE, or ONLY GOD, and nearly two hundred in which he is styled *God absolutely*, while there is not *one* in which the *Son is so called.*

30th. There are ninety passages in which all prayer and praises are directed to *God the Father*, and which imply that all things should be directed *to his glory and honour*; and the manner of address is *uniformly through Christ.* And out of 1300 passages, wherein the word God is mentioned, not one *necessarily implies* the existence of a plurality of persons.

31st. Those passages in which Jesus Christ is *declared positively*, or the *implication*, to be *subordinate* to the Father, *deriving from him his being, receiving from him his divine power*, and acting in all things wholly in *subjection* to the *authority* and *will of the Father*, are in number above 300.

32d. In a word, the *supremacy* of the *Father*, and the *inferiority* of the *Son*, is the simple and indisputable *doctrine of the Bible.* Whereas the doctrine of the Son's

equality, or *identity* with the Father, is clothed in *mystery*, *encumbered with difficulties*, and *dependent*, at the best, on but a *few passages for support*.

SYSTEMATIC METHOD

OF PROVING THAT

THE SON IS INFERIOR TO THE FATHER.

I. THE SCRIPTURES TEACH THAT CHRIST DERIVED HIS BEING, AND ALL THAT HE HAS, FROM THE FATHER.

1. *His life.* As the Father hath life in himself, so has he given to the Son to have life in himself. John v. 26. I live by the Father. John vi. 57.

2. *His power.* The Son can do nothing of himself. John v. 19. All power in heaven and earth is given unto me. Mat. xxviii. 18. Of my own self, I can do nothing. John v. 30.

3. *His doctrine.* My doctrine is not mine, but his that sent me. John vii. 16. As the Father has taught me, I speak. John viii. 28.

4. *His commission.* I came not of myself, but he that sent me. John viii. 42. The Father sent the Son to be the Saviour of the world. 1 John iv. 14. The living Father hath sent me. John vi. 57. He was faithful to him that *appointed* him. Heb. iii. 2.

5 *His office and authority.* God made Jesus both Lord and Christ. Acts iii. 36. God hath exalted him to be a Prince and a Saviour. Acts v. 31. A prophet shall the Lord your God raise up to you. Acts iii. 22. The Lord sware, and will not repent: Thou art a priest for ever. Psal. cx. 4. The Father hath committed all judgment to the Son. John v. 24. He was ordained of God to be the judge of quick and dead. Acts x. 42.

6. *His honour and glory.* God hath given him a name above every name, that at the name of Jesus every

knee should bow. Phil. ii. 10. My Father hath given me to sit down on his throne. Rev.

II. Jesus is dependent on the Father, for all his Mediatorial qualifications, success, and rewards.

1. *The power by which he wrought miracles.* My Father, who dwelleth in me, doeth the works. John xiv. 10. The works that I do in my Father's name, bear witness of me. Jesus of Nazareth approved of God by miracles, and wonders, and signs, which God did by him. Acts ii. 22.

2. *The gifts of the Spirit.* God giveth him the Spirit not by measure. John iii. 34. I will pray the Father, and he shall give you another Comforter, whom I will send to you from the Father. John xiv. 16, and xv. 26. This Jesus, having received of the Father the promise of the Holy Ghost, hath shed forth this which you now see and hear. Acts ii. 33. God anointed Jesus of Nazareth with the Holy Ghost, and with power. Acts x. 38. There shall come forth a rod out of the stem of Jesse—the Spirit of the Lord shall rest on him—the Spirit of wisdom and understanding—the Spirit of counsel and might—the Spirit of knowledge and of the fear of the Lord. Isa. xi. 1, 2. Behold mine Elect, in whom my soul delighteth; I have put my Spirit on him. Isa xlii. 1.

3. *His success.* I the Lord will hold thy right hand, and will keep thee, and give thee for a covenant of the people. Isa. xlii. 6. The Lord said to my Lord, Sit thou at my right hand, till I make thy foes thy footstool. Ps. cx. 1. The Father hath put all things under the feet of the Son, yet he is excepted who put all things under him. 1 Cor. xv. 27.

4. *His reward.* Jesus, for the joy set before him, endured the cross, and despised the shame. Heb. xii. 2. To him that overcometh, I will grant to sit down in my kingdom, as I overcame and am sit down in my Father's kingdom. Rev. iii. 21. He humbled himself, and became obedient even to the death of the cross, wherefore God highly exalted him. Phil. ii. 8, 9. Therefore, I will divide him a portion with the great, and he shall

divide the spoil with the strong, because he poured out his soul to death. Isa. liii. 12.

III. JESUS CHRIST ALWAYS ACTS IN SUBORDINATION TO THE WILL, APPOINTMENT, COMMANDS, AND HONOR OF THE FATHER.

1. *The will.* I came not to do mine own *will*, but the will of him that sent me. Not my will, but thine be done. John vi. 38, and Luke xxii. 42.

2. *The appointment.* He was faithful to him that appointed him. Heb. iii. 2. God has appointed a day in which he will judge the world, by that man whom he hath ordained. Acts xvii. 31.

3. *The Commands.* As the Father gave me commandment, even so I do. John xiv. 31. I have kept my Father's commandments. John xv. 10.

4. *The honour.* I seek not mine own glory, but I honour my Father. John viii. 49. Every tongue shall confess that Jesus is Lord, to the glory of God the Father. Phil. ii. 11.

THE END.

~~MAY 3 1 1984~~

~~DEC 2 4 1995~~

Acme
Bookbinding Co., Inc.
100 Cambridge St.
Charlestown, MA 02129

3 2044 037 703 501